DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 300 909 EA 020 473

AUTHOR White, Paula A.
TITLE Resource Materials on School-Based Management. CPRE Research Report Series RR-009.
INSTITUTION Center for Policy Research in Education.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Sep 88
GRANT OERI-G008690011
NOTE 56p.; For a related document, see EA 020 472.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications, Center for Policy Research in Education, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, Douglass Campus, New Brunswick, NJ 08901 ($4.00; quantity discounts).
PUB TYPE Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131) -- Reference Materials - Directories/Catalogs (132)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administration; Administrative Organization; Administrative Policy; Annotated Bibliographies; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Management Systems; Professional Personnel; Researchers; Resource Materials; *School Based Management
IDENTIFIERS *Policy Research

ABSTRACT

This document is a three-part collection of information on school-based management which includes: (1) a list of researchers and practitioners with knowledge and expertise on school-based management; (2) a list and summary of school-based management programs throughout the country; and (3) an annotated bibliography on school-based management. The research for this document was conducted from September 1986 through May 1987. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED300909

CPRE
CENTER FOR POLICY RESEARCH IN EDUCATION
a consortium:

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY
RUTGERS

Michigan State University

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN-MADISON

EA 020 473

Resource Materials on School-Based Management

Paula A. White

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CENTER FOR POLICY RESEARCH IN EDUCATION (CPRE)

CPRE unites four of the nation's leading research institutions in a unique venture to improve the quality of schooling. The consortium members are: the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey; the School of Education at Michigan State University; the School of Education at Stanford University; and the Wisconsin Center for Education Research at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education, CPRE conducts research on the implementation and effects of state and local education policies. By communicating its findings to policymakers, the Center attempts to contribute to the framing of education policies that will have a positive impact on children in classrooms.

CPRE's research activities are concentrated in five major areas:

- Policies on Curriculum and Student Standards
- Teacher Policies
- Educational Indicators and Monitoring
- New Roles and Responsibilities
- Evolution of the Reform Movement

In addition to conducting research in these areas, CPRE publishes reports and briefs on a variety of education issues. The Center also sponsors regional workshops for state and local policymakers.

CPRE Research Report Series

Research Reports are issued by CPRE to facilitate the exchange of ideas among policymakers and researchers who share an interest in education policy. The views expressed in the reports are those of individual authors, and are not necessarily shared by the U.S. Department of Education, CPRE, or its institutional partners. This publication was funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, grant number OERI-G008690011.

To obtain copies of this and other CPRE publications, contact: Center for Policy Research in Education, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick, NJ 08901; attention: Publications. Phone: (201) 828-3872.

CPRE
CENTER FOR
POLICY RESEARCH
IN EDUCATION
a consortium:

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY
RUTGERS

Michigan
State
University

STANFORD
UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY of
WISCONSIN-
MADISON

Resource Materials on School-Based Management

Paula A. White

September 1988

CPRE Research Report Series RR-009

RESOURCE MATERIALS ON SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT

This document is a three-part collection of information on school-based management. Part A (pages 1-4) is a list of researchers and practitioners with knowledge and expertise on school-based management. Part B (pages 5-24) is a list and summary of school-based management programs throughout the country. Part C (pages 25-51) is an annotated bibliography on school-based management. The research for this document was conducted from September 1986 through May, 1987. Therefore, it is likely that some of the contacts persons and programs listed here have changed. However, these materials represent a good starting point for persons who want to learn more about school-based management, where school-based management programs are located, and who to contact for more information.

PART A

CONTACTS ON SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT

This list of resource people includes school superintendents, principals, and directors, researchers and practitioners of school-based management (SBM). These individuals have been identified as having knowledge and expertise in SBM through research and involvement in the implementation of SBM programs. While this list is not exhaustive, these individuals could provide valuable assistance and information on SBM.

Contacts on School-Based Management:

Barron, Melanie, Stoney Brook University, New York, New York. Barron served as director of the SBM program in the Boston Public Schools.

Caputo, Edward, Principal, Key Largo Elementary School, Key Largo, Florida. Caputo has written several articles on SBM and the role of the principal. He is presently a principal in Key Largo, Florida, a district which has implemented SBM.

Carr, Larry, Principal, Dover Elementary School, Fairfield-Susan Unified School District, Fairfield, California. Carr has served as principal at Dover Elementary School during the implementation of SBM in the district.

Corey, Stanley, Superintendent, Irvine Unified Public Schools, Irvine, California. Corey has been involved in the SBM implementation process in the district.

Dickey, William, Comptroller, Alachua County School Board, Gainesville, Florida. Dickey has served as Business Administrator for Alachua County during the implementation of SBM in the district.

Fowler, Charles, Superintendent, Sarasota County, Florida. When Fowler became superintendent in December, 1985, the district became committed to the development of SBM.

Garms, Walter, College of Education, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York. Garms has done research and consulted with school districts and state legislatures on school management and budgeting methods.

Gowler, Douglas, Principal, Sagebrush Elementary School, Cherry Creek School District, Aurora, Colorado. Gowler has been a principal in the Cherry Creek School District for fifteen years. In 1978 Gowler was asked to open one of six new elementary schools in the district. As principal, Gowler was involved in the SBM planning process in the district.

Guthrie, James, Professor of Education, University of California, Berkeley, Guthrie has published several articles and consulted extensively on the topic of school budgeting and SBM.

Henriquez, Armando, Superintendent of Schools, Monroe County, Key West, Florida. Henriquez has served as superintendent of Monroe County since January, 1968 and has played a major role in the implementation of SBM in the district.

Heynderickx, James, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, Eugene Oregon. Heynderickx is completing a chapter on SBM for the revised edition of School Leadership (1981), which is being prepared for publication in 1988.

Jones, Jerome, Superintendent, St. Louis Public Schools, St. Louis, Missouri. In 1984, Jones helped to initiate SBM in the district and has continued to be involved with the SBM planning process.

Kirst, Michael, School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, California. Kirst has done research and consulted with school districts and state legislatures on school management and budgeting methods.

Lamontagne, Charles, Superintendent, Lunenburg Public School District, Lunenburg, Massachusetts. Lamontagne has served as superintendent under a system of SBM in the Lunenburg Public School District. SBM was introduced to the district in 1982 while William C. Allard was superintendent.

Longstreth, James, Professor of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida. Longstreth served as superintendent of the Alachua County School District in Gainesville, Florida from 1972-1977. Longstreth was instrumental in developing a SBM program during this time.

Marburger, Carl, National Committee for Citizens in Education, Suite 410, Wilde Lake Village Green, Columbia, Maryland. Marburger is one of three Senior Associates responsible to a Board of Directors for the operation of the National Committee for Citizens in Education (NCCE). He has been responsible for the SBM training conducted by NCCE and convened the first symposium on SBM in Denver in 1978.

Martines, Francis, Director, School-Based Management, Cleveland Public Schools, 1380 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio. Martines has served as Director of SBM in the Cleveland Public Schools during the implementation of SBM in the district.

Moretti, Ernest, Superintendent, Fairfield-Suisan Unified School District, Fairfield, California. Moretti has served as superintendent during the implementation of SBM in the district.

Navitsky, James, Superintendent, Martin School District, Stuart, Florida. SBM was initiated in the district in 1976 and Navitsky has been superintendent during and since its implementation.

Owens, Jack, Director of School Supervision and Support, Milpitis School District, California. Owens has been involved in the SBM implementation process as Director of School Supervision and Support for the district.

Payzant, Tom, Superintendent of Schools, San Diego County, California. Payzant served as superintendent under a SBM program in Eugene, Oregon for ten years and has been instrumental in pushing for the program in San Diego.

Pierce, Larry, Professor of Education, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon. Pierce has studied and written extensively on SBM and the operation of districts which have implemented SBM programs.

Prophet, Matthew, Superintendent, Portland School District, Portland, Oregon. Prophet was superintendent under a decentralized management system in the Lansing School District in Lansing, Michigan, from the late seventies to early eighties. Prophet is currently superintendent of the Portland School District where he has been instrumental in decentralizing the district.

Purkey, Stewart, Professor of Education, Lawrence University, Appleton, Wisconsin. Purkey has written extensively on effective schools and has identified SBM as an important variable.

Rennie, Robert, Director of Data Processing for Brevard County School District in Titusville, Florida. Rennie has been an active participant in the development and growth of SBM in Florida.

Sande, Robert, Principal, Jefferson Elementary School, Rochester Independent School District, Rochester, Minnesota. In 1983, Sande helped initiate the Jefferson self-directed learning program in an effort to develop the concept of SBM.

Sang, Herb, Superintendent, Duval County Public Schools, Jacksonville, Florida. Sang was instrumental in developing a SBM program in the district when he became superintendent in 1976.

Skiff, Diane, Associate, Local School Advisory Committee (LSAC), Cincinnati Public Schools, Cincinnati, Ohio. Skiff has been involved in the SBM planning process since 1982 when SBM was introduced to the district.

Slezak, James, Former Superintendent, Mt. Diablo Unified School District, Concord, California. Slezak began a SBM program in the Mt. Diablo district when he became superintendent in 1976. He had previously introduced a SBM program in the Escondido (California) district where he was superintendent from 1969-1976. In 1980, Slezak left Mt. Diablo to become the executive director of the Association of California School Administrators.

Smilanich, Bob, Associate Superintendent for Curriculum, Edmonton Public School District, Alberta, Canada. Smilanich has been involved with the implementation of SBM in the Edmonton School District.

South, Oron, Professor of Education, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida. South served as a consultant for several school districts in Florida which have adopted SBM programs.

Strembitsky, Michael, Superintendent, Edmonton Public School District, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. Strembitsky has been instrumental in the implementation of SBM in the Edmonton School District.

Sullivan, Patrick, Principal, Valley Middle School, Rosemount, Minnesota. Sullivan has been actively involved in the SBM planning process since its introduction to several schools in the district in 1983.

Tornillo, Pat, Executive Vice President United Teachers of Dade, Chief Negotiator, Dade County, Florida. Tornillo is involved in developing a SBM pilot program for the 1987-88 school year in Dade County.

Tyler, Jean, Executive Director, Citizens' Governmental Research Bureau, 125 East Wells Street, Suite 616, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. The Citizens' Governmental Research Bureau has completed a survey on SBM and compiled the information into a four page article which appears in the Citizens' Governmental Research Bureau Bulletin, Vol. 74, No. 6, November 1, 1986.

Waddell, Eleanor, Finance Officer, Oak Grove District, San Jose, California. Waddell has served as finance officer in the Oak Grove School District during the implementation of SBM in that district.

Walker, Kay, Administrative Assistant, Susan Lindgren School, St. Louis Park, Minnesota. Walker is actively involved in the SBM planning process for Lindgren School.

Wells, Barbara, Principal, K.I. Jones Elementary School, Fairfield-Suisan Unified School District, Fairfield, California. Wells has served as principal under the SBM program in the Fairfield-Suisan School District.

Wiesner, Glenn, School-Based Management Project Manager, St. Louis Public Schools, St. Louis, Missouri. Wiesner has been involved in the SBM planning process since SBM was initiated in 1984.

PART B

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

This list is based on interviews of personnel in local school districts with school-based management (SBM) programs and a review of articles and papers on SBM. While this list is not exhaustive, programs were located through a "snowball" process; information from one respondent led to information regarding additional locations. Over 100 districts in 18 states plus the province of Alberta, Canada are listed. The states with the most extensive programs in several districts include California, Florida, Minnesota, and New Jersey. Following the name of the school district, a brief summary of each program is provided. Due to the large number of California districts which have implemented aspects of SBM, summaries are provided for only six of the districts. Wherever possible, contact person(s) and references for each district, are listed.

School-Based Management Programs:

ARIZONA

Roosevelt School District, Phoenix, Arizona

Contact(s): Hadley Thomas, Assistant Superintendent
Laverne White, Principal, Palmdale School
Betty Capella, Teacher and Member of School Advisory Committee, South West School

The Roosevelt School District has 18 schools and 1986-87 enrollment was approximately 10,600 students. School advisory committees serve as the main outlet for SBM in the Phoenix School District. The committees make recommendations regarding the budget and curriculum. However, decisions regarding personnel selection remain with the central office.

CALIFORNIA

Contact(s): James Guthrie, Professor of Education, School of Education, University of California, Berkeley

SBM in California was stimulated in part by state legislation. The Early Childhood Education Act introduced elements of SBM such as school site councils and parent involvement in programs. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, a consortium of 25 superintendents, Gov. Jerry Brown, and members of the California State Board of Education expressed interest in SBM and encouraged implementation of the system. Despite efforts to start the system in numerous districts, the implementation of SBM in California was slow and was not expanding. Possible explanations for the limited success of the programs include

a lack of commitment and trust between central administrators and school staff, the restrictive nature of California's education code, and limited funds and lack of time to put the necessary effort into the program.

The following California school districts are listed in Decker, et al. (1977) as having implemented aspects of SBM. The list was compiled by the California Association of School Business Officials and the California State Department of Education's School District Management Assistance Team. Decker, et al., have explained the listing as follows:

> An asterisk preceding the name of a district indicates that the principals in that district have moderate to substantial latitude in decision making. The number given in parentheses after each entry is the enrollment figure for the district as shown in the 1977 California School Directory, Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1977 (p.24).

Alameda County

*Berkeley Unified, 1414 Walnut Street, Berkeley, CA 94709 (14,990)

Fremont Unified, 40774 Fremont Boulevard, Fremont, CA 94538 (31,407)

Livermore Valley Joint Unified, 685 Las Positas Boulevard, Livermore, CA 94550 (14,551)

Oakland Unified, 1025 Second Avenue, Oakland, CA 94606 (53,315)

Contra Costa County

*Mt. Diablo Unified, 1936 Carlotta Drive, Concord CA 94519 (42,894)

*San Ramon Valley Unified, 699 Old Orchard Drive, Danville, CA 94526 (12,367)

Fresno County

Fresno Unified, Education Center, Tulare and M Streets, Fresno, CA 93721 (54,749)

Humboldt County

Eureka City Elementary/Eureka City High, 3200 Walford Avenue, Eureka, CA 95501 (9,439)

Los Angeles County

ABC Unified, 16700 South Norwalk Boulevard, Cerritos, CA 90701 (38,554)

Lancaster Elementary, 44711 North Cedar Avenue, P.O. Box 1750, Lancaster, CA 93534 (6,699)

Lawndale Elementary, 4161 West 147th Street, Lawndale, CA 90260 (4,782)

Long Beach Unified, 701 Locust Avenue, Long Beach, CA 90813 (57,815)

Los Angeles Unified, 450 North Grand Avenue, P.O. Box 3307, Terminal Annex, Los Angeles, CA 90051 (740,586)

Norwalk-La Mirada Unified, 12820 South Pioneer Boulevard, Norwalk, CA 90650 (24,074)

Redondo Beach City Elementary, 1401 Inglewood Avenue, Redondo Beach, CA 90278 (6,855)

*Rowland Unified, 1830 Nogales Street, Rowland Heights, CA 91748 (16,217)

Sulphur Springs Union Elementary, 18830 Soledad Canyon Road, Canyon Country, CA 91351 (2,256)

Walnut Valley Unified, 476 South Lemon Road, Walnut, CA 91789 (6,338)
Whittier Union High, 12102 East Washington Boulevard, Whittier CA 90606 (18,846)

Orange County
Centralia Elementary, 6625 La Palma Avenue, Buena Park, CA 90620 (5,750)
*Cypress Elementary, 9470 Moody Street, Cypress, CA 90630 (5,910)
Fountain Valley Elementary, Number One Lighthouse Lane, Fountain Valley, CA 92708 (11,448)
Fullerton Elementary, 1401 West Valencia Drive, Fullerton, CA 92633 (11,261)
Garden Grove Unified, 10331 Stanford Avenue, Garden Grove, CA 92640 (47,475)
*Huntington Beach Union High, 5201 Bolsa, Huntington Beach, CA 92647 (29,160)
Irvine Unified, 2941 Alton Avenue, P.O. Box 19535, Irvine, CA 92664 (10,670)
Laguna Beach Unified, 550 Blumont Street, Laguna Beach, CA 92651 (3,151)
*Newport-Mesa Unified, 1601 16th Street, P.O. Box 1368, Newport Beach, CA 92663 (25,211)
Ocean View Elementary, 7972 Warner Avenue, Huntington Beach, CA 92647 (13,970)
Placentia Unified, 1301 East Orangethorpe Avenue, Placentia, CA 92670 (17,664)
Santa Ana Unified, 1405 French Street, Santa Ana, CA 92701 (27,138)
Westminter Elementary, 14121 Cedarwood Avenue, Westminster, CA 92683 (10,116)

Riverside County
San Jacinto Unified, 600 East Main, San Jacinto, CA 92383 (1,877)

Sacramento County
*Folsom-Cordova Unified, 1091 Coloma Street, Folsom, CA 95630 (11,800)

San Bernadino County
Chaffey Joint Union High, 211 West Fifth Street, Ontario, CA 91762 (12,703)
Colton Joint Unified, 1212 Valencia Drive, Colton, CA 92324 (10,281)
Ontario-Montclair Elementary, 950 West D Street, P.O. Box 313, Ontario, CA 91761 (15,188)
San Bernardino City Unified, 799 F Street, San Bernadino, CA 92410 (31,850)
Upland Elementary, 904 West Ninth Street, P.O. Box 1239, Upland, CA 91786 (5,799)
Yucaipa Joint Unified, 12592 California Street, Yucaipa, CA 92399 (4,440)

San Diego County
*Escondido Union Elementary, 980 North Ash Street, Escondido, CA 92027 (9,519)
La Mesa-Spring Valley Elementary, 4750 Date Avenue, La Mesa, CA 92041 (13,312)

San Diego City Unified, 4100 Normal Street, San Diego, CA 92103 (122,213)

Santa Barbara County
*Goleta Union Elementary, 5689 Hollister Avenue, Goleta, CA 93017 (6,165)

Santa Clara County
Album Rock Union Elementary, 2930 Gay Avenue, San Jose, CA 95127 (14,370)
Cupertino Union Elementary, 10301 Vista Drive, Cupertino, CA 95014 (18,362)
*Fremont Union High, Box F, Sunnyvale, CA 94087 (14,317)
Gilroy Unified, 7663 Church Street, Gilroy, CA 95020 (5,734)
Los Gatos Joint Union High, 809 University Avenue, P.O. Box 1257, Los Gatos, CA 95030 (4,549)
Palo Alto City Unified, 25 Churchill Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94306 (12,637)
San Jose Unified, 1605 Park Avenue, San Jose, CA 95126 (37,690)
Santa Clara Unified, 1889 Lawrence Road, P.O. Box 397, Santa Clara, CA 95052 (19,537)

Santa Cruz County
*Soquel Union Elementary, 620 Monterey Avenue, Capitola, CA 95010 (2,020)

Solano County
*Fairfield-Suison Unified, 1025 Delaware Street, Fairfield, CA 94533 (12,015)
Vacaville Unified, 751 School Street, Vacaville, CA 95688 (7,752)
Vallejo City Unified, 211 Valle Vista, Vallejo, CA 94590 (14,543)

Tulare County
Linsay Unified, 519 East Honolulu, Lindsay, CA 93247 (2,223)

Ventura County
Conejo Valley Unified, 1400 East Janas Road, Thousand Oaks, CA 91360 (19,748)
Fillmore Unified, 627 Sespe Avenue, P.O. Box 697, Fillmore, CA 93015 (2,876)
Simi Valley Unified, 875 East Cochran, Simi Valley, CA 93065 (24,397)

Yale County
Woodland Joint Unified, 175 Walnut Street, Woodland, CA 95695 (7,480)

Fairfield-Suison Unified, Fairfield, California

Contact(s): Ernest Moretti, Superintendent
Barbara Wells, Principal, K.I. Jones Elementary School
Larry Carr, Principal, Dover Elementary School

The Fairfield-Suison Unified School District began the move to SBM in March, 1973. Objectives of the program included: 1) establishing a committee of administrators to do a comparative management study; 2) determining the system most appropriate to the district; 3) developing a system of site-level budgetary decisions; 4) establishing a budget calender which provided for community and staff input; 5) improving the community's knowledge of the school district by establishing a district informational system; 6) presenting a recommendation for a management system to the governing board.

The 1986-87 enrollment was approximately 15,000 students. According to district principals Larry Carr and Barbara Wells, the adoption of SBM drastically changed the role of the site administrator. The principal gained much more control over the budget, curriculum and selection of staff. The adoption of a decentralized management system encouraged principals to promote greater participation of parents and staff in making decisions for the benefit of the children.

References: Lindelow, 1981, pp. 29-31; Wells and Carr, 1978.

Irvine Unified, Irvine, California

Contact(s): Stanley Corey, Superintendent

In 1972, when the district was created there were six elementary schools and one high school. The 1986-87 enrollment was approximately 19,000 students with a total of 27 schools. The superintendent and school board pushed for the implementation of SBM in the district. Initially, the school site was given authority to make decisions regarding the budget, personnel and curriculum. However, due to financial problems in the district and state reforms, the school site no longer has as much discretion over the budget or curriculum.

References: Lindelow, 1981, pp 31-33

Milpitis School District, California

Contact(s): Jack Owens, Director of School Supervision and Support, Milpitis School District, California

The Milpitis School District was in the SBM planning process with a Staff Development Program which created school-based training teams. The program was designed to involve teachers in the curriculum development process. The impetus for the program came from interest on the part of the superintendent and the decision to integrate SBM in the district as a part of a state-wide accountability program in California.

According to Jack Owens, director of school supervision and support in the district, SBM gave the school site a much greater sense of autonomy. The greatest impact of the program, Owens reported, was the involvement of teachers in curriculum development which allowed teachers to focus more on the content of what they teach. Owen also noted a clearer delineation of roles and a greater sense of the principal, teachers, students and parents working together. However, Owen stated that the program had not been in place long enough to conclude whether or not major changes were made in governance and communication patterns within the school.

Mt. Diablo Unified, Concord, California

Contact(s): James Slezak, Former Superintendent, 1976-1980 (Served as Superintendent in Escondido, California from 1969-1976. (In 1980 Slezak became executive director of the Association of California School Administrators)

In 1977 the district received a federal Title IV-C project grant to implement a SBM system. In 1980, California rated Mt. Diablo the most successful project in the state and gave the district additional funds to distribute the results of their SBM program throughout the state. Principals were asked to volunteer their schools to participate in the program. In the first year 5 schools volunteered, the second year 14, the third year 31, and in the fourth year 44 of the district's 58 schools had initiated SBM programs. The gradual initiation of SBM helped to limit implementation problems.

References: Lindelow, 1981, pp.35-37

Oak Grove School District, San Jose, California

Contact(s): Robert Lindstrom, Superintendent
Eleanor Waddell, Finance Officer

The 1986-87 student enrollment for the Oak Grove District's 22 schools was approximately 12,000. Oak Grove began a gradual five-year implementation of decentralized management in 1972. Decentralization was viewed as the best way to handle rapid growth in enrollment as well as a means to encourage community involvement and support for the programs and finances of the district. However, according to Eleanor Waddell, finance officer for the district, the district had not decentralized to the extent that it had hoped to.

References: Lindelow, 1981, pp. 33-35

San Diego County, California

Contact(s): Tom Payzant, Superintendent
Berth McClusky, Deputy Superintendent

The district has about 155 schools and its 1986-87 enrollment was approximately 115,000 students. Superintendent Payzant worked under SBM as superintendent in Eugene, Oregon for 10 years, and was instrumental in pushing for the program in San Diego. The San Diego district had not initiated a SBM program in its entirety. However, it introduced an evolutionary program of decentralized decision making and increased autonomy for principals regarding budget and staffing. The San Diego district looked at the Edmonton (Alberta, Canada) plan for further direction on how to better organize SBM in their district.

According to Superintendent Payzant, the major problem of implementation has been one of perception. Payzant was optimistic about the degree to which principals' autonomy and decision-making authority were increased. However, he noted that principals were not as optimistic and did not perceive themselves as

having a great deal of flexibility. For example, principals had the authority to decide the number of teachers and the number of aides to be hired in each subject area, and the number of full-time and part-time positions, but they did not have authority over who is hired.

COLORADO

Cherry Creek School District, Aurora, Colorado

Contact(s): Richard Koeppe, Superintendent
Don Goe, Deputy Superintendent
Doug Gowler, Principal, Sagebrush Elementary School
Mike Volkl, Principal, High Plains Elementary School

The 1986-87 enrollment for the district was approximately 26,400. SBM had been developed and refined in the district over a long period. For the 15 years that Doug Gowler had been a principal in the district, the schools were operating under a system of SBM. Principals played a major role in the planning process, selecting teachers, and designing curricula. In cooperation with a teacher team, principals were responsible for designing the budget. Each school was involved in SBM to varying extents. According to Gowler, most principals supported the program and liked the control they were given as well as shared decision-making with teachers. However, Gowler said that not everyone likes the program as much as he does.

Each school had a parent advisory committee which met regularly to discuss needs and concerns. Gowler says that there had not been much success in attracting the non-parent community to the meetings; in most cases they showed up for the first meeting but did not have enough interest to return again. On the other hand, Gowler noted, community members have been extremely supportive of SBM since they feel that education is being geared to the needs of the child. In demonstration of their support, Gowler indicated that the Cherry Creek School District had never lost a bond issue or referendum.

In terms of patterns of participation, Gowler reported that teachers were given more responsibilities which has promoted leadership and a greater sense of ownership. In terms of governance and communication patterns, SBM has created greater reciprocity and trust between the students and teachers. The most common problem that the district encountered in implementing SBM, was a lack of understanding regarding the program. For example, when new teachers or principals moved into the district it often was difficult for them to understand the SBM system and they might have supported a more centralized management system. Superintendent Richard Koeppe resigned in 1987 and the school board expressed interest in selecting a new superintendent supportive of decentralization (as the last one was).

References: Gowler, 1980; Lindelow, 1981.

Jefferson County, Colorado

Contact(s): John Peper, Superintendent
Ed Steinbrecher, Assistant Superintendent
Sue Shift, Staff Developer

With approximately 120 schools and 77,000 students in 1986-87, the district had practiced forms of decentralized management for about 18 years. The school site had decision-making authority over the budget, curriculum and personnel. Decentralized management in Jefferson County was perceived more as a philosophy of the district rather than as a program. Sue Shift, staff developer in Jefferson County, reported that the increased autonomy of the principal's position requires a person with a particular type of personality, including excellent leadership qualities. The principal is directly accountable to the superintendent and the school must submit annual school improvement plans. According to Shift, the district's local school advisory committees, composed of parents, members of the non-parent community and students (at the high school level), served to create an improved communication link between the school and community.

FLORIDA

Alachua County School District, Gainesville, Florida

Contact(s): James Longstreth, Former Superintendent, 1972-1977
William Dickey, Business Administrator for Alachua County

SBM was initiated in Florida in an attempt to rebuild and reform education in the state after the disruptive teachers' strike in 1968. The Alachua County School District in North Central Florida initiated SBM in 1972, when James Longstreth became superintendent. Longstreth left the district in 1977 to become professor of education at the University of Florida, Gainesville. The new superintendent of Alachua County School District was not a strong supporter of decentralization and the district moved back to a more centralized structure.

References: Dickey, 1977; Lindelow, 1981, pp. 23-26

Broward County School District, Florida

Broward County made a rapid transition from traditional management to SBM in 1973, when the Educational Finance Program was passed. Budgets were prepared by the school staff and submitted to the district for approval. Parents and teachers participated in the decision-making process through district advising councils. SBM was not very successful in Broward county and the district reverted back to a more centralized system in 1978. Possible explanations for the program's limited success are the rapid period in which the change was implemented and discontent on the part of key participants such as principals who were not satisfied with their new roles and teachers who felt their roles had not changed.

References: Lindelow, 1981, pp. 26-27

Dade County, Florida

Contact(s): Pat Tornillo, Executive Vice-President United Teachers of Dade, Chief Negotiator

Dade County is the largest school district in Florida and one of the largest in the U.S. The 1986-87 student enrollment was approximately 236,000. An Articulated School-Based Management Plan (ASBMP) began in 1981. In the 1987-88 school year, 32 of the district's 260 schools were to be involved in the program. The SBM program in Dade County aimed to provide faculty and principals with greater decision-making authority and control over budget, curriculum, and the operation of schools including staffing. Impetus for the program evolved out of a collective bargaining contract and support from the superintendent. Individual schools volunteered to participate in the program, and each building was required to develop its own school plan.

References: "Improving Education in Florida: A Reassessment," 1978.

Duval County, Jacksonville, Florida

Contact(s): Herb Sang, School Superintendent
Susan Boyer, Principal, Beulah Beal Elementary School

SBM was implemented in the district in 1976. Duval County is the seventeenth largest district in the country with 144 schools and its 1986-87 enrollment was approximately 102,000 students. Principal Paula Potter called the district "a textbook case of SBM," with schools setting-up their own budgets and controlling funds, hiring personnel, and participating in textbook selection and curriculum monitoring. Superintendent Herb Sang was instrumental in pushing for the SBM program and he said that the major objective of SBM was to provide the best possible environment for students. Sang said principals were the instructional leaders of the district, with principals reporting directly to the superintendent.

Each school had a local school advisory committee composed of parents, community members, teachers and the principal. The role of the committee was advisory, but it played an active part in preparing the annual school report and in the budget process. Sang indicated that the program has been extremely successful and the district was selected by the Danforth Foundation as the model urban district in the nation for their achievement. Sang attributed the success of the program to the principals and their ability to exercise their decision-making authority. Principal Potter attributed much of the success of the program to the superintendent and she reported that 99 percent of the principals in the district would agree.

References: Annual School-Based Program Budget, Duval County Schools, 1982-83.

Martin County, Florida

Contact(s): James Navitsky, Superintendent

The 1986-87 enrollment in the district was approximately 10,000 students. The district initiated a system of SBM in 1976 in an attempt to deal with increasing enrollments and in response to teachers' and parents' requests for increased participation. With input from teachers, staff, and school advisory groups, principals make the final decisions regarding the budget, curriculum and personnel.

Monroe County School District, Key West, Florida

Contact(s): Armando Henriquez, Superintendent
Oron South, Consultant to Monroe County

From 1971-1976 the county moved from centralized management to SBM. The state's reform legislation and the unique geography of the county helped to foster the program. Monroe County is composed of a long chain of islands (the Florida Keys) and the school centers are clustered in three geographic areas about 50 miles apart. Armando Henriquez became superintendent of Monroe County in 1969 and played a major role in the implementation of SBM in the district. During the first few years of his position in Monroe County Henriquez tried to use traditional methods such as inservice teacher training and adding curriculum coordinators to improve education in the district. After three years with little significant improvement, the superintendent, together with the central office staff and principals started the move towards a decentralized system. Training emphasis was shifted from the central office personnel to the building personnel and principals were elevated from middle management to top management with an increase in salary as well as responsibility.

References: Lindelow, 1981, pp 19-23; Marburger, 1985; South, 1975

Sarasota County, Florida

Contact(s): Charles W. Fowler, Superintendent
Dr. Kitty Tracey, Educational Specialist

Sarasota County has 17 elementary, 5 middle, and 5 high schools, and its 1986-87 enrollment was approximately 25,000 students. The district began to facilitate SBM in 1986 based on the premise that the closer a decision is made to the student served by the decision, the better it is likely to be. Sarasota County has been practicing elements of SBM for some years under a team-based management program. When Charles Fowler became superintendent in December, 1985, the district became committed to the development of SBM.

ILLINOIS

Chicago, Illinois

Contact(s): Joseph Lee, Deputy Superintendent

The 1986-87 enrollment for the district was 430,000 with 495 elementary schools, 65 high schools and approximately 40 other schools. School-based budgeting in the Chicago Public Schools was mandated by the Illinois legislature (beginning school year 1985-86) in an attempt to provide more local accountability. SBM councils are not new to the district. SBM councils have been in existence for several years, however they are now mandated by law. Membership on the councils includes principals, teachers, parents and community members. The principal is not a voting member of the council. The council makes recommendations regarding the budget, curriculum development and the hiring of personnel.

MASSACHUSETTS

Boston, Massachusetts

Contact(s): Dr. Robert Spillane, Former Superintendent (1979-1985)
Jean Sullivan Mckeigue, President of the School Committee
May Wong, Educational Specialist, Boston Public Schools
Prof. Melanie Barron, Center for Teaching and Learning Science, Stoney Brook University, New York

Boston began a SBM program in 1982, with 7 pilot schools in the first year, 12 schools in the second year, and 24 schools in the third year. Impetus for the program came from the Massachusetts Education Improvement Reform Law as well as from Superintendent Spillane's interest in SBM. Documentation from Florida's SBM programs was adapted for the Boston district. The major objectives of the program were to give the schools more say in how they are run, including more flexibility in money allocation and a greater say in recruiting school personnel. Every school had a school site council and each council was composed of the principal, two teachers, three parents, one community member and in the high schools, one non-voting student member.

MICHIGAN

Detroit, Michigan

Contact(s): Clement S. Sutton
Kathleen Smith

The district had been involved with a SBM program for 14 years. State legislation enacted in 1970 served to decentralize the governance structure of the school system into eight regional boards of education and a central board of education. The objectives of SBM were to place greater administrative control and accountability for budget development and monitoring at the school level.

SBM had resulted in a greater degree of involvement and control of the budget process at the school level. However, public participation in the budget process had not increased significantly with SBM.

Lansing, Michigan

Contact(s): Matthew Prophet, Former Superintendent (Prophet is currently superintendent in Portland, Oregon)
Richard Halik, Superintendent

The essential elements of SBM in Lansing, Michigan were initiated in 1971 and continued until 1981. Each school had a 12 to 35-member citizen involvement committee consisting of parents, teachers, students (at the secondary level) and building administrators, including the principal. Problems of isolation and the development of a great variety of curricula resulted in a return to more centralized management.

References: Lindelow, 1981, pp. 38-39; Throop, 1973

MINNESOTA

Independent School District #196, Rosemount, Minnesota

Contact(s): Patrick Sullivan, Principal, Valley Middle School, Rosemount, Minnesota

SBM was introduced to six out of the fifteen schools in the district, including three elementary and three middle schools. The schools received a three-year grant from the Northwest Area Foundation, beginning in 1983. Membership on SBM councils at each school included the principal, teachers, parents and community members and the councils were encouraged to participate in decisions regarding curriculum, new staff, staff development, and assessment of community needs. The most important element of the SBM program was a decentralized budget. According to Principal Patrick Sullivan, the district was already quite decentralized in terms of curriculum. Since the introduction of SBM, there had been five different superintendents. Sullivan reported that SBM had outlasted the superintendents, with or without their support.

References: Northwest Area Foundation, 1985

Independent School District #281, Robbinsdale Minnesota

Contact(s): George Scarbrough, Director of Secondary Education, Independent School District #281, Robbinsdale, Minnesota

This district received a three-year grant from the Northwest Area Foundation, with the first year of project implementation beginning in 1983-84. One elementary school, one high school, and an intermediate school received grants to introduce the SBM program and one high school introduced the SBM program without the support of a grant. SBM councils were established at the participating schools, consisting of staff members, students, parents, and non-

parent community members. According to George Scarbrough, director of secondary education, SBM did not increase authority at the school site, but it encouraged the sharing of authority within the school. Scarbrough predicted the SBM program would continue but not necessarily expand. Without the support of the grant money, the district did not have the resources to expand the program.

References: Northwest Area Foundation, 1985

Rochester Independent School District, Rochester, Minnesota

Contact(s): Robert Sande, Principal, Jefferson Elementary School, Rochester Independent School District, Rochester, Minnesota

Jefferson Elementary School received a three-year grant from the Northwest Area Foundation to develop a SBM program. Jefferson Elementary was the only school in the district to introduce SBM and the program was initiated in 1983. A SBM council met on a bi-monthly basis and consisted of five staff members, the principal, three parents, two students, and two community members. By putting the authority to make decisions as close to the action as possible, the program sought to improve the student environment and to involve community members in school activities. SBM gave the school authority over some budget and curriculum decisions, but union regulations prevented the SBM council from making decisions regarding the hiring of personnel. Union members have argued that non-professionals should not be given the authority to make decisions regarding the hiring of teachers.

References: Northwest Area Foundation, 1985

St. Louis Park School District #283, St. Louis Park, Minnesota

Contact(s): Kay Walker, Administrative Assistant, Susan Lindgren Intermediate Center, St. Louis Park, Minnesota

In the spring of 1983, the Susan Lindgren Intermediate Center received a three-year grant from the Northwest Area Foundation to develop a SBM program. A SBM council was established consisting of three parents, two community people, four staff members, and three representatives of specific school organizations. Initially, the council also consisted of two student members. However, after the first year students were no longer included on the council due to their poor attendance and lack of interest. According to Kay Walker, SBM gave the school a great deal of influence over curriculum development and a limited amount of decision-making authority regarding budget decisions. The SBM program did not include the decentralization of decisions regarding the hiring of school staff.

References: Northwest Area Foundation, 1985

MISSISSIPPI

Jackson District, Mississippi

Contact(s): Robert N. Fortenberry, Superintendent
Henrietta Allen, Administrative Assistant

The district has 55 schools and its 1986-87 enrollment was approximately 33,100 students. A shared governance policy at each school required that each school's shared governance council meet regularly to discuss issues and concerns regarding school organization. The council was comprised of a minimum of four teachers, two parents, two representatives of the non-parent community and two students at the high school level. The principal made all the decisions regarding the hiring of personnel. Each school was given a budget allocated on a per student basis. According to Henrietta Allen, administrative assistant in the district, it would be impossible for the district to decentralize all decisions due to the large size of the district. Allen predicted that there would be too much confusion without central control regarding the budget and curriculum.

MISSOURI

Chesterfield, Missouri

Contact(s): James Dixon, Coordinator, Equal Opportunity Education Program, Chesterfield, Missouri

The Parkway School District in Chesterfield, Missouri had a 34-year tradition of school autonomy. The district was formed as a result of a merger of four rural school districts. There are 25 schools in the district including 4 high schools, 4 junior high schools and 17 elementary schools. The 1986-87 student enrollment was approximately 23,000 students. Over the years, the district maintained the belief that the school and staff have a better understanding of the needs of the school. Therefore, SBM was not necessarily a new process in the Parkway School District. According to James Dixon, coordinator of the Equal Opportunity Education Program for the district, the policy of SBM affects all 25 schools, but it takes a different direction in each school in terms of the external consultant role and philosophy. The major goal of SBM in the district has been to place greater responsibility for management and the budget at the school site.

St. Louis, Missouri

Contact(s): Jerome Jones, Superintendent
Dr. Glenn R. Wiesner, School-Based Management Project Manager, Harris-Sto State College, St. Louis, MO

In 1984, Superintendent Jerome Jones worked with Carl Marburger of the National Committee for Citizens in Education (NCCE) to initiate the SBM process in the entire school system. Of the district's 128 schools, 116 participated in the SBM program and each participating school had a SBM council. Half of the council's membership was represented by parents and community members and the

other half was represented by principals, faculty and students (at the upper-grade levels). The main goals of the SBM program in St. Louis were to encourage shared authority and to involve citizens and school staff in a joint decision-making body. After three years of implementation the district had not had enough time to create an environment of change and was continuing efforts to decentralize budget, curriculum and personnel decisions.

NEW JERSEY

Pine Hill, South Brunswick, Vernon Township, Perth Amboy, Gailoway Township, East Windsor are six New Jersey school districts that were trained in SBM by the National Committee for Citizens in Education (NCCE) for approximately three years, beginning in 1978. The main outlet for the programs has been through the SBM council.

References: Marburger, 1985

East Windsor, New Jersey

Contact(s): Fred Wian, Principal, Heightstown High School, Heightstown, N.J.

East Windsor was trained in SBM by NCCE. However, following the training, the program was turned down by the school board and superintendent.

Galloway Township, New Jersey

Contact(s): Donald Dearborn, Superintendent
Thomas Niland, Principal, Pomona School District
Mary Davis, Teacher and SBM Council Member

Perth Amboy, New Jersey

Contact(s): Herbert Richardson, Principal, Perth Amboy Public School #10, Perth Amboy, N.J.

Pine Hill, New Jersey

Contact(s): Charles M. Ivory, Superintendent

South Brunswick, New Jersey

Contact(s): Stephanie Craib, Principal

Vernon Township, New Jersey

Contact(s): Dr. Ann Keim, Principal, Rolling Hills Primary School

OHIO

Cincinnati, Ohio

Contact(s): James Jacobs, Superintendent
Diane Skiff, Associate, Local School Advisory Committees

The SBM program in Cincinnati was initiated in response to a financial crisis. In 1979, the Cincinnati Public Schools shut down for two weeks because of desperate financial conditions. In the summer of 1980 the community mobilized for a tax levy campaign, the first successful one in 11 years. Success was largely due to the efforts of the community. The following fall, Cincinnati began an innovative program for encouraging increased community participation in the local schools by initiating local school budgeting in 10 schools. By 1982, it was mandated throughout the system. The major objectives of Cincinnati's SBM program have been to increase community participation, to develop a shared decision-making process and to increase individualization by enabling individuals closest to the school site to make decisions regarding the school.

The Cincinnati Public Schools had a unique system of budget decision making. The local advisory councils made budgetary recommendations which encompassed curriculum and staffing levels. For example, a local council could seek to maintain their full-time clerk and full-time reading aide by not replacing the assistant principal. These local decisions were then approved or rejected (with reasons) by the administration.

Cleveland, Ohio

Contact(s): Francis S. Martines, Director, School-Based Management, Cleveland Public Schools
Gloria Jackson, Principal, Almira Elementary School

A SBM program was initiated in Cleveland in 1983, involving six pilot schools. In 1984, 30 schools were involved in the program; in 1985, 60 schools; and in 1986, 127 schools (out of 128 total district schools). Initiative for the program came from a court order to desegregate the school district and to decentralize personnel selection and resource management. The Cleveland School District looked at the Edmonton (Alberta, Canada) plan for further direction on how to better organize SBM in their district.

References: Morgan, 1983

OKLAHOMA

Tulsa, Oklahoma

Contact(s): Larry Zenke, Superintendent
Gordon Calwetti, Former Superintendent
Rolland A. Bowers, Assoc. Superintendent for Financial Services
George Fowler, Principal, Nathan High School (Fowler is on the NASSP Board of Directors)

In 1969-70 an Administrative Development Program was initiated by the Central Administrative Staff in an attempt to respond to the need for decentralized decision making. In 1986 the program was extended to include school-based budgeting (SBB) and was initiated in 40 of the 88 schools in the district. The district was in the first phase of a three year program for SBB. The major goal of the program was to give principals and staff more flexibility and responsibility over school-site decisions.

References: Calwetti, 1971; Tulsa World, Feb. 4, 1981, "Happy Days Are Here Again: Why Larry Zenke Smiles So Much"

OREGON

Clackamas County School District #62, Oregon City, Oregon

Contact(s): Don Tank, Deputy Superintendent, P.O. Box 951, Oregon City, Oregon 97045

The SBM program was introduced to the district in the fall of 1983 when three schools (one elementary, one junior high, and one senior high) received a grant from the Northwest Area Foundation. The program gave the school site more decision-making authority regarding school budget and curriculum development. The schools already had a considerable amount of autonomy even before the program was introduced, with parent advisory councils and autonomy regarding the hiring of school personnel. The program has served to give schools more decision-making authority regarding the school budget and curriculum development. According to Don Tank, deputy superintendent in the district, training in shared decision making improved communications and problem solving within the school.

References: Northwest Area Foundation, 1985

SOUTH CAROLINA

Charleston County, South Carolina

Contact(s): Dr. Ronald McWhirt, Former Superintendent 1982-86
Dr. Robert Burke, Superintendent
Pat Bowler, Coordinator of Local School Administration

South Carolina was the third state, after Florida and California, to enact legislation regarding SBM. SBM was initiated in Charleston County in 1982. Of the 69 schools in the district, 40 were operating under the SBM program. Each year, 10 schools volunteer to take part in the program and are provided with a four-year training program. The SBM model in Charleston County is a vertical rather than a horizontal model; based on the view that every school has different needs and therefore requires different resources, and the belief that central staff should treat the needs of each school individually. Each school involved in the SBM program has a SBM team composed of the principal, teachers, parents, non-parent community members and students (at the high school level).

References: Beers, 1984

UTAH

Salt Lake City

Contact(s): Dr. M. Donald Thomas, Former Superintendent, 1979-85
John W. Bennion, Superintendent
Robert Wakefield, Public Information Officer, Salt Lake City School District

In 1973 the Salt Lake City School District was experiencing declining enrollment, a loss of state funds, friction between employee groups and the administration, and a lack of support from the community. When a new superintendent, Donald Thomas, was hired that year, he agreed to take the position only if the school board would institute shared governance in the district. Under Salt Lake City's shared governance approach, the Board and superintendent shared control over many decisions with teachers' association and parents, and a teacher evaluation system incorporated accountability, informal remediation and formal remediation. Each school has two SBM councils including a staff council with teacher representatives, classified staff and administrators and a council which includes these members as well as parents, students and the community.

The district has 37 schools and its 1986-87 enrollment was approximately 24,000 students. According to Robert Wakefield, public information officer for the district, the principal is the key to making shared governance work. If the principal believes in sharing authority, then he or she can make it work very well, but if the principal does not support shared governance, then it may result in a power struggle between the principal and the teachers. Wakefield stated that the two most common implementation problems include: 1) some principals have grown up under traditional management systems and have difficulty in sharing their authority, and 2) some principals are not as skilled as they should be in

encouraging participation and getting people to reach a consensus. Teachers, according to Wakefield, were very supportive of shared governance because they enjoyed the increased flexibility it gave them regarding the goals of the school.

A new superintendent, John Bennion, came to the district in 1985. Bennion had not been as supportive of the shared governance policy as the previous superintendent and it is possible that the new superintendent's management style may cause a pulling away from shared governance toward more centralized control.

References: Lindelow, 1981; Wakefield, 1983; Wise et al., 1984

WASHINGTON

Edmonds School District #15, Edmonds, Washington

Contact(s): Pauline Cline, Principal, Mount Lake Terrace High School, 21801 44 Avenue West, Mount Lake Terrace, Washington 98043

Mount Lake Terrace High School received a grant to develop a SBM program from the Northwest Area Foundation in 1983. The basic rationale behind the program was to improve the output and productivity of the school and to increase staff involvement in school-site decisions, by putting decision-making authority in the hands of the people most affected by them. A SBM council was organized consisting of 20 members, including the principal, teachers, students, parents and community members. The SBM council was given the authority to make decisions regarding the budget, curriculum and personnel.

References: Northwest Area Foundation, 1985

WISCONSIN

Madison, Wisconsin

Contact(s): Jerry Patterson, Assistant Superintendent

Administrative reorganization in 1972 served to decentralize and give the local school greater decision-making authority. In 1984-85 the district implemented a School Improvement Planning Process. During the 1987-88 school year, School-based budgeting was to be implemented on a pilot basis.

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Contact(s): Bill Larkin, Asst. Superintendent
Jean Tyler, Executive Director, Citizens' Governmental Research Bureau, Inc., 125 East Wells St., Suite 616, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 53202-3580

The Milwaukee Public Schools held hearings in March, 1987 to discuss proposals to implement a SBM pilot program in the district.

References: "More Decision-Making Authority is Proposed At the School Building Level." In Fact, Citizens' Governmental Research Bureau Bulletin, Vol. 74, No. 6, 1986, 4 pages.

CANADA

Edmonton Public School District, Alberta, Canada

Contact(s): Michael Strembitsky, Superintendent
Bob Smilanich, Assoc. Superintendent for Curriculum

The 1980-81 enrollment of this district was 65,000. School-based budgeting was initiated in all of the district's 160 schools in December, 1979 after a three-year pilot project in seven volunteer schools in the district. In its eighth year of operation SBM in Edmonton included all of its schools. The SBM program in Edmonton has been studied widely by other districts as an example to model their own programs after, since Edmonton comes closest to representing a SBM model in its entirety. In the Edmonton SBM program the school site was responsible for budgeting for staff, supplies, equipment and services. The program was based on the belief that individuals at the school site are in the best position to decide what should be done in the individual schools. The parts of the budget which remained centralized include building maintenance and renovation, substitute teachers to cover long-term illness, and utilities.

PART C

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT

This annotated bibliography has been prepared to briefly summarize articles and papers on school-based management. Over eighty references written by researchers and practitioners of school-based management are included. Where possible, affiliations of authors at the time their work was published are listed. Several themes are covered including general references on school-based management, guidelines for school-based management, school-based budgeting, accountability, shared decision making, school site councils, school-based curriculum development, the role of the community, the role of the principal, the role of the teacher, case studies of school-based management and miscellaneous items relevant to school- based management. While every article and paper does not focus solely on school-based management, they all give primary attention to this topic.

General

Cohen, Michael. "Instructional Management and Social Conditions in Effective Schools." In Odden and Webb (Eds), School Finance and School Improvement Linkages For the 1980s, Ballinger Publishing Company, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1983, pp. 17-50.

Michael Cohen, team leader of the Effective Schools Team and senior associate at the National Institute of Education, expresses the view that school improvement will occur only if individual schools are given the autonomy to develop policies according to local circumstances and particular problems. Increased autonomy would allow school staffs to develop some degree of ownership of new practices and would serve to enhance professionalism, motivation, and shared commitments.

Doyle, Denis P., and Finn, Chester E. "American Schools and The Future of Local Control." The Public Interest, No. 74-77, 1984, pp. 77-95.

Denis P. Doyle and Chester E. Finn argue that local control of public education in the traditional sense is disappearing. Many factors are suggested as reasons for the failure of local control such as the uneven size of local units, divergent economic conditions, inattentiveness to the importance of school-level educational decision making, insistency on uniformity across all schools in a community, and school board members more concerned with circumstances they have little control over than with applying themselves within the many policy domains where they have immense leverage. Alternatives to local control are discussed including: 1) modified centralization where the state education agency would run all public schools through bureaucratic sub-units designed to correspond to geographic divisions of the state, 2) rationalized regionalism where public schools would

be regrouped into larger units and each unit would have its own elected board and appointed superintendent or, 3) a statewide public education voucher system financed with state revenues where all funds would go to the individual students, based on the assumption that better education will result from parents who may freely select from a wide diversity of schools.

Gasson, John. "Autonomy, the Precursor to Change in Elementary Schools." National Elementary Principal, Vol. 52, No. 3, 1972, pp. 83-85.

At the time of publication, author John Gasson was on the faculty at the University of Calgary, Alberta, Canada. Gasson argues that if educators are to make responsible decisions regarding their schools, then they must be granted a large degree of autonomy. Gasson points to British elementary schools as an example of increasing autonomy for principals by giving them the responsibility to hire their own teachers. With the principal's role changed from dependent business manager to autonomous educational leader, and with the teachers able to apply for positions in specific schools, Gasson argues that the relationships of the central office staff to the principal and of the principal to the teachers would inevitably change. While Gasson does not believe that principal autonomy and teacher decision making will result in the immediate humanization of every elementary school, he believes increased autonomy at the school site will increase the chances for schools to become more sensitive and responsive to student needs.

Holdaway, E. A. "Some Concerns, Ideas and Approaches of School Administrators." The Canadian Administrator, Vol. XV, No. 1, October 1975, pp. 1-4.

E. A. Holdaway, Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, Edmonton, presents a summary of concerns of educational administrators in Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand. The author obtained the information by attending conferences, reading reports and interviewing staffs of government departments, local authorities and universities, colleges and other schools. Information is arranged under the headings of overall organization, community involvement, school organization, staffing, students and curriculum development. In selecting issues and approaches, attention was paid to the frequency of mention, and to the importance and relevance as perceived by the author. The issues and approaches found to be of the most significance to administrators were the increasing involvement of the community in school affairs, the increasing autonomy of individual schools, changes in procedures for instruction and evaluation of senior secondary students, changes in the supervisor-teacher relationship, and closer examination of the process and meaning of curriculum development.

Lindelow, John. "School-Based Management." In Smith, Mazzarella and Piele (Eds), School Leadership Handbook For Survival, Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, 1981, pp. 106-141.

This report discusses school-based management, as viewed by proponents of the system, with particular attention given to the role of the principal in such a management system. The organizational structure in school-based management systems replaces the district with the school as the primary unit of educational decision making. The new balance of powers, according to John Lindelow, has proven quite successful in numerous districts where it has been implemented. This report includes a description of several school-based management programs in school districts in Florida and California, Lansing (Michigan), Edmonton (Alberta), Cherry Creek (Colorado), Louisville (Kentucky), Eugene (Oregon), Salt Lake City (Utah) and New York City. The description of programs includes discussions from a number of interviews with superintendents, school board memebers, teachers and school personnel associated with school-based management programs.

Meyer, John. "The Impact of The Centralization of Educational Funding and Control on State and Local Organizational Governance." Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, Stanford University, Program Report No. 79-B20, 1979. 28 pages.

John Meyer, professor of sociology and education, Stanford University, considers the potential impacts on state and local educational organizations of various forms of centralization. He concludes that fragmented centralization in American education has in each subunit level expanded administrative size, increased differentiation and generated a massive middle-level educational bureaucracy, which has become less and less able to respond to the local systems of control. Two solutions are offered: either the system should turn to a more authoritative and integrated centralization or there should be a shift in funding organization back to a more local or state system.

Pierce, Lawrence C. "School Site Management." Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, Palo Alto, California, 1977. 29 pages.

Lawrence Pierce examines current school management and budgeting practices and proposes the use of school-site management as one way to encourage more coherent, understandable schooling. He discusses deficiencies of centralized school budgeting and proposes that school-site management may help to enhance school responsiveness. Peirce describes the organization of school-site management including the topics of the school site as the basic unit of education management, parent advisory councils, the principal as education manager, school site budgeting, the state's role in school site management, annual performance reports and collective bargaining. The report also outlines the phases in implementing school-site management.

Purkey, Stewart, and Smith, Marshall. "Effective Schools: A Review." The Elementary School Journal, Vol. 83, Nol 4, 1983, pp. 426-452.

Stewart Purkey and Marshall Smith, University of Wisconsin, critically review the school effectiveness literature. The literature is criticized for using narrow and relatively small samples for intensive study, making errors in identification of outlier schools, aggregating achievement data at the school level, making inappropriate comparisons and using subjective criteria to determine school success. The authors identify the variables they believe to be most important for organization-structure. Included among these is the concept of school-site management. Studies indicate that leadership and staff of a school need considerable autonomy in determining the course of action to improve academic achievement levels.

"School-Based Management. The Best of ERIC on Educational Management." ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, Eugene, Oregon, 1980. 5 pages.

This annotated bibliography includes 11 items on school-based management. Topics covered include the pros and cons of the decentralization of budgeting, the administrative role, site management, and decision making. The publications reviewed in this bibliography support the concept of school-based management because it encourages greater flexibility and faculty commitment, more effective communication, improved decision making and increased community involvement in public education.

Tucker, Harvey J.; and Zeigler, L. Harmon. "The Politics of Educational Governance: An Overview." ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, 1980. 73 pages.

When this essay was published, Harvey J. Tucker was a research associate in the Center for Educational Policy and Management at the University of Oregon. He is now Assistant Professor of Political Science at Texas A&M University. L. Harmon Zeigler is a research associate in the Center and Professor of Political Science at the University of Oregon. This book examines the policy-making process in local school districts, including proposal development, executive recommendation, legislative action, decision-making, and policy implementation. There is a discussion of the recruitment of school administrators, the relationship of the community to the school board, and the history of the reform movement in educational governance.

Turnball, Brenda J. "Using Governance and Support Systems to Advance School Improvement." The Elementary School Journal, Vol. 85, No. 3, January 1985, pp. 337-351.

Brenda Turnball, Policy Studies Association, Washington, D.C., analyzes how school improvement may be affected by resources and demands originating outside local districts, and outlines strategies that districts can use in managing these resources and demands. In the first section, the governance and support systems that typically surround school districts are described. The second section discusses how school systems and external systems mirror each other's characteristics, especially with respect to program specialization,

as well as the issue of the local implementation of requirements and suggestions that originate outside the district. In the third section, Turnball discusses local strategies for using the resources that outside systems provide and coping with the constraints that they present.

Accountability

Benveniste, Guy. "The Design of School Accountability Systems." In Guthrie, James W., Kirst, Michael W., Policy Analysis for California Education, 1984. 36 pages.

Guy Benveniste believes that accountability in education should focus on schools as the relevant performance unit and not on individual students or teachers. Accountability has three main functions: to inform, to re-orient action, and to justify what is done. Benveniste provides an outline of an accountability system including a discussion of a classification of schools, top-down incentives, bottom-up accountability, and parsimonious measurements. He concludes that more accountability is not necessarily better accountability. Better accountability means that we are concerned with attracting good people to teaching and making teaching a desirable profession, and finding ways of making teachers, students and the community more responsible and committed to education.

Keene, T. Wayne. "School-Based Management: Missing Link in Accountability?" Education, Vol. 101, No. 1, 1980, pp. 32-40.

Author Wayne Keene, writing from the University of South Florida, Tampa at the time of publication, questions whether the aims of accountability would be better served if authority was shifted from central school district offices to the individual school district offices. Keene raises important questions and issues educational leaders must confront when moving to school-based management, including issues related to students, staff, curriculum, facilities, finance, and citizen advisory groups.

Miller, James P. "Accountability and the Schools: Being Responsible or Being Responsible To?" Paper presented at Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association meeting, Las Cruces, New Mexico, November 16-17, 1972. 34 pages.

In this monograph, James P. Miller of the Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association, New Mexico State University, argues that school organizations must meet the challenge of accountability through becoming responsible rather than expending energies on being responsible to. He says that excessive concern with being responsible to the public is unjustifiable from evidence, dysfunctional for the schools themselves, and makes it impossible to reach any genuine consensus. On the other hand, he says, if school districts meet the accountability challenge with the intention of improving their own responsibility per se, both the schools and their publics will benefit from improved decision making, improved organization behavior, and an increase in the outputs expected of the schools.

Guidelines For School-Based Management

Burton, Nancy, et al. "School-Based Planning Manual." Seattle Public Schools, Washington Department of Planning, Research and Evaluation, 1982. 143 pages.

As Part II of the Seattle Public Schools' School-Based Planning Manual, prepared by the Washington Department of Planning, Research and Evaluation, this manual was designed to assist principals and program managers in the Seattle Schools as they moved toward school-based management. The first section provides district-wide guidelines for school-based planning including the development of objectives, evaluation procedures and alternative strategies. The second section contains sample data on students, communities and school personnel to serve as a model for other districts. The final section contains sample planning worksheets.

Finn, Chester E. "Toward Strategic Independence: Nine Commandments for Enhancing School Effectiveness." Phi Delta Kappan, April, 1984, pp. 518-524.

Chester Finn, professor of education and public policy at Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee when this article was published, addresses the question of whether there is more to be gained through enhancing the cohesiveness and spirit of individual units by giving them greater authority and direction or through centralizing and standardizing. Finn offers nine "commandments" for laymen who set policies for schools at state and local levels: 1) recognize the school as the key organizational unit in education; 2) set rigorous educational standards for entire states and communities, but emphasize broad goals and essential outcomes, not specific procedures, curricula, or timetables; 3) encourage schools to be different, except for the core of cognitive skills and knowledge that all students in a system or state should acquire; 4) develop effective school-level leadership by selecting and nurturing first-rate principals and removing weak ones; 5) aside from the choice of principals, make the selection and deployment of professional staff predominantly a school-level responsibility; 6) treat teachers as individuals who differ from one another in ability, interests, and experience but who must function collegially if their schools are to be effective; 7) more budgetary authority should devolve to the school level; 8) state and federal policy makers should generally avoid inhibiting school-level governance in the fundamental realms of teaching, learning, and internal organization; and 9) recognize that improving school effectiveness is a dynamic, cyclical process that takes place over a long period of time.

Guthrie, James W. "Creating Efficient Schools: The Wonder Is They Work At All." In The Financing of Quality Education, Urban League of Rochester, N.Y., Inc., 1977. 27 pages.

James Guthrie describes the failure of present and past efforts to enhance school efficiency. He ascribes this failure to several factors including a reduction in citizen participation, disagreement over objectives, measurement difficulties in assessing progress toward educational goals, absence of scientific principles regarding "production" techniques, little control of schools over the "raw material" with which they must work, and monopolistic

tendencies of public schools over their clients. In order to enhance school efficiency, schools should be made the basic management unit. The principals, as chief executive officers, should be given control over the discretionary portion of their building's budget and over the hiring and firing of personnel. A greater link must be established between schools and the community they serve. This link may be accomplished through the formation of a parent council at each school site, which serves an advisory role regarding budget allocation, textbook purchase, and personnel selection, and has strong input in the selection of the principal. Guthrie recommends that each school prepare an annual performance report to evaluate the progress of the program toward its objectives.

"High School Program Seminar Report." Seattle Public Schools, Washington. Prepared by the Office of Educational Planning, 1983. 88 pages.

This report outlines the Seattle Public Schools' high school program, with an emphasis on preparation for college and employment. Recommendations generated at the seminar, which was directed by the Seattle School Board in 1982-83, were to serve as guidelines for schools as they moved toward the district's goal of school-based management. The public's perception of Seattle high schools is generally good, however, concern is expressed regarding the inadequate training given to students for future jobs. Recommendations are made regarding curriculum, instruction, guidance, counseling, support services, organization and finance, and policy.

Longstreth, James. "School-Based Management and Budgeting Systems: A Guide For Effective Implementation." National Urban Coalition, Washington, D.C., 1979. 150 pages.

James Longstreth, College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, based the information in this guidebook on school-based management programs in San Jose, California; Phoenix, Arizona; Key West, Florida; and Gainesville, Florida. Each of these districts has developed school-based management to different extents. Some have experienced stages of recentralization while others have maintained or extended decentralization. Longstreth identifies the key questions or decision points which must be addressed and answered for a district to successfully implement school-based management and school-based budgeting.

Marburger, Carl. (1985). <u>One School At A Time: School-Based Management A Process For Change</u>. National Committee For Citizens in Education, Columbia, Maryland, 1985. 48 pages.

Carl Marburger, senior associate of the National Committee for Citizens in Education (NCCE), has been in charge of the school-based management training conducted by NCCE and organized the first national symposium on school-based management held in Denver in 1978. <u>One School At A Time</u> is a handbook directed towards those interested in starting school-based management programs in their school or school district. Following the 1978 national conference, NCCE began a series of school-based management training programs with six New Jersey school districts: Pine Hill, South Brunswick, Bernon Township, Perth Amboy, Gallaway Township and East

Windsor. This handbook is written primarily from the experience gained through facilitation of school-based management programs in these districts.

"More Decision Making Authority is Proposed at the School Building Level." In Fact, Citizen's Governmental Research Bureau Bulletin, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Vol. 74, No. 6, November 1, 1986. 4 pages.

In this issue of In Fact, the concept and benefits of school-based management are examined and the school-based management programs now operating in several urban school districts are described. Districts include Edmonton, Alberta; Cincinnati, Ohio; Charleston, South Carolina; Tulsa, Oklahoma; and Cleveland, Ohio. Guidelines are recommended for instituting school-based management pilot programs in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Parker, Barbara. "School-Based Management: Improve Education By Giving Parents, Principals More Control Of Your Schools." American School Board Journal, Vol 7., July, 1979, pp. 20-24.

Barbara Parker, associate editor of the American School Board Journal describes the tendency to view school-based management as the salvation of public education. The real problem, however, has been the lack of understanding regarding the concept. Parker defines school-based management as a return of decision making to the local level. The views of several proponents of school-based management are offered to provide an explanation of the concept. The article includes a list of factors essential for school-based management to be successful.

Pierce, Lawrence C. "School-Based Management." OSSC Bulletin, Vol. 23, No. 10, 1980. 51 pages.

Lawrence Pierce discusses the origins of school-based management and suggests steps that should be taken to implement a successful school-based management program. He describes the difficulties involved in balancing centralization and decentralization and outlines the assumptions and biases underlying the principle of school-based management. Legislative changes must be made at the state level and changes are required at the district and school level regarding the role of central school administrators, principals, teachers and other members of the community. While acknowledging that reform will be slow to occur, Pierce argues that since school-based management would improve education by making it more understandable and responsive to citizens, teachers, parents and students, it is worth the effort and time.

Prasch, John C. "Reversing The Trend Toward Centralization." Educational Leadership, Vol. 42, No. 2, October, 1984, pp. 27-29.

John Prasch, instructor at Teachers College, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, examines how school districts can reverse the trend toward centralization and encourage local autonomy and ownership. The principal must be given the control and responsibility over the school site. Each school should be given an annual budget and principals, in consultation with their staffs should be given the responsibility for the requisitioning, management,

distribution, and utilization of supplies within the building. Decisions regarding the selection of staff must also be moved to the building level. Regarding the curriculum, the district should have a recommended rather than a required course of study and establish procedures by which a school can legitimately use other materials. The curriculum should be expressed in terms of goals, objectives, and expected outcomes since the method of producing the desired result is best left in the hands of the building staff.

"Rebuilding Education To Make It Work." Citizens League Report, prepared by the Educational Alternatives Committee, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1982. 66 pages.

The Citizens League of Minneapolis, Minnesota is an independent, nonpartisan, nonprofit corporation dedicated to helping to solve complex public problems. To prepare this report, a volunteer committee of League members met 42 times over thirteen months to take testimony from numerous observers of and participants in education. The committee, with the help of League staff members, developed the report for approval by the Leagues' Board of Directors. Two members of the board filed dissenting opinions. In the report, the League concluded that more authority should be placed with the individual school and parents should be given more authority over the education budget. The League suggests that education must be deregulated and decentralized for three reasons: 1) to achieve a separation of policy and production; 2) because schools have been asked to address more conflicting goals than they can reasonably be expected to deal with; and 3) to assist schools in becoming different from each other and thus increasing diversity and choice.

"Shared Governance: Active Cooperation For A More Effective Education." Training Manual, Second Edition, Salt Lake City School District, January 1983.

This training manual was created to inform the Salt Lake City School District personnel on the concept of shared governance. Shared governance is based on the philosophy that education is a responsibility of the public and therefore the public should be actively involved in exercising that responsibility. Shared governance can work only when participants gain a thorough understanding of its structure. The four principles under which it operates are: 1) the principle of delegation. 2) the principle of consensus and parity; 3) the principle of review and appeal, and 4) the principle of trust openness, and equity. The immediate and long-range objective for shared governance in the Salt Lake City Schools is to provide a system for translating patrons' expectation and meaningful involvement into support for accomplishments by the students in the district. A shared governance management system faces the contraints of federal and state laws on education, school board education policy, budgeting restrictions and obligations, and principles of ethics.

South, Oron. "School-Based Management." Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida, 1975. 18 pages.

This document was distributed by the Florida Department of Education to assist school districts moving toward school-based management. Author Oron South describes two major requirements for districts planning to initiate a school-based management program including: 1) a lengthy transition process, and 2) agreement on the general nature of the school-based management program i.e., clarifying what is to be decentralized and specifying the tasks and functions that will remain centralized. South contrasts centralized with decentralized management, discussing the role changes and reorganization of school centers necessitated by school-based management programs.

Role of The Community

Schofield, Dee. "Community Involvement In Educational Governance." School Leadership Digest Second Series, No. 2, National Association of Elementary School Principals, Arlington, Virginia, 1975. 31 pages.

Dee Schofield, was employed by ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management as a research analyst and writer, at the time of publication. A literature review identifies the implications and underlying assumptions of community involvement in the education power structure. Two contradictory views exist on community involvement: the democratic ideal that people should have control over the governmental institutions they create, and the view that professionals are better qualified to have control over policy. The report addresses issues such as decentralization of power, unionization, consumerism and consumer advocacy, citizen advisory committees and community education programs and how these trends have affected the degree and kind of community involvement in the education power structure.

Role of The Principal

Allard, William. "The Reorganization of a School System." Catalyst for Change, Vol. 13, No. 1, Fall, 1983, pp. 26-30.

William Allard, superintendent of schools in Lunenburg, Massachusetts, expresses his belief that principals must be the total educational leader of the school building. As the total leader, the principal must be responsible and be made responsible for everything that takes place in the building including curriculum, staff and student evaluation, discipline, purchasing, monitoring of achievement and staff morale. It is important that the principal possess or be trained in these management skills. It is also important that the principal have close contact and be in constant communication with the superintendent and central office staff. Organizational charts for the Lunenburg Public Schools are included to demonstrate the implications of reorganization on the role of the superintendent, principal and teacher.

Bremer, John. "Power and the Principalship." National Elementary Principal, Vol. 55, No. 2, November-December 1975, pp. 18-21.

As professor of education at Western Washington State College, Bellingham, Washington, at the time of publication, author John Bremer examines the concept of power and the notion of "public" in our school system. Bremer expresses the view that the principalship must be broadened and expanded and that the role must have much greater autonomy. If schools are to be truly public, then the principal must be given the authority to represent the interests of the community.

Caputo, Edward. "Principal or Wizard: Brains + Heart + Courage = Five Principles of School-Based Management. Paper presented at the annual meeting of Elementary School Principals, 1980. 16 pages.

Edward Caputo, principal of Key Largo Elementary School, Key Largo, Florida, emphasizes the influence of the principal on teacher morale and classroom performance and consequently, on student achievement. Five principles of school-based management are contrasted with traditional management techniques, referred to as "the Wizard of Oz." The five principles include giving lower-level employees as much freedom as they need to do their job, limiting the amount of detailed reporting to principals by teachers and focusing on freedom and responsibility, allowing the individual school staff to control their own budget, fostering a system that encourages creativity and innovation, and creating a balance between the principal's role and personality to allow for affective relationships with teachers.

Cawelti, Gordon, and Howell, Bruce. "Help for the Man in the Middle, a Program to aid building principals and decentralize decision making." School Management, Vol. 15, No. 3, March 1971, pp. 22-23.

Gordon Cawelti, superintendent of schools in Tulsa, Oklahoma and Bruce Howell, assistant superintendent for instruction at the time of publication, discuss the problem of the principal's role as the "middle man." The principal is faced with the problem of representing community concerns and at the same time supporting administrative decisions, which at times may be conflicting. The solution as the authors see it is to decentralize and give the principal more decision-making authority. The Administrative Development Program was initiated by the central administrative staff during the 1969-70 school year, in an attempt to recognize the need for decentralized decision making. The article describes the three-phase plan for group-paced, self-paced and independent study activities.

Gowler, Doug. "A Principal's Open Letter To Stephen Bailey." National Elementary Principal, Vol. 59, No. 4, 1980, pp. 17-18.

Doug Gowler, principal of Sagebrush Elementary School, comments on the notion of the classroom teacher and the role of the principal in response to a lecture by Stephen Bailey at the IDEA Fellows Institute. Gowler expresses optimism regarding new methods of teaching and school organization in the Cherry Creek School District, Aurora, California. In 1978, Gower was asked to open one of six new elementary schools in the district. As principal, Gowler became a part of the planning process. He had control over the budget, selection of teachers, and the design of the curricula and he encouraged community involvement. Gowler reports community and student support of the system.

Houts, Paul. "The Changing Role of the Elementary School Principal." National Elementary Principal, Vol. 55, No. 2, 1975, pp. 62-63.

Paul Houts, director of publications and editor of National Elementary Principal, at the time of publication, reports on ideas generated at a February, 1975 meeting in Maryland of 26 educators. Houts describes the variety of forces that affect and act on the principalship and explores alternative solutions to special problems that principals currently face.

Ingram, R. "The Principal: Instructional Leader, Site Manager, Educational Executive." Thrust For Educational Leadership, Vol. 8, No. 5, 1979, pp. 23-25.

R. Ingram, principal of Mark Twain School, Long Beach Unified School District, California, discusses problems surrounding the principal's role and suggests three conditions necessary for improvement: 1) The development of an executive attitude is essential for principals to acquire executive authority. The principal should clearly communicate to staff what the goals are and how to achieve them. 2) The principal should demonstrate sound managerial skills in planning, organizing, coordinating, controlling and evaluating. 3) Numerous details of executive management need to be resolved to allow principals to be effective site leaders. These include giving principals increased authority over hiring and firing of staff and control over funds at the school site to implement decisions.

"An Interview with Scott Thomson." NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 64, No. 432, 1980, pp. 76-84.

Scott Thomson, who in 1980 replaced Owen Kierman as chief executive officer of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, discusses his plans, projections for education and the principalship, and the Association's priorities for the 1980s. Thomson points out the need for school principals to have maximum flexibility and authority to accomplish objectives developed by superintendents and boards of education.

May, William J. "Managerial Discretion the Key to a Principal's Performance as Leader in an Effective School." Education Canada, Vol. 23, No. 4, 1983, pp. 4-9.

Professional educators (teachers and principals) have the authority to decide how educational outcomes are to be achieved, but not what those outcomes should be. William J. May, director of educational administration at School District No. 45 in West Vancouver concludes that the principal's role as an educational leader is severely limited and that greater authority must be given to the school site or education reform is likely to affect the surface but not the substance of the public school system.

Morison, Sidney. "The Politics of Decentralization." National Elementary Principal, Vol. 59, No. 4, 1980, pp. 58-60.

Sydney Morison, principal of P.S. 84 in New York City argues that principals need to have more control over resources and more authority to make decisions at the local level. Despite 10 years of decentralization in New York City, according to Morison, the real power is still strongly centralized. Community school board members and principals are neither party to negotiations nor partners in making policy decisions. For example, they cannot hire or fire teachers and they have little to say regarding the budget or school curriculum. While community school boards are restricted from making policy on a broad scale, Morison describes specific ways they can influence the direction of schools in their districts and suggests that the community board may be the only hope for keeping the struggle for decentralization alive.

Sang, H. "School-Based Management and the Role of the Principal - Where Does The Buck Stop?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1980. 9 pages.

Herb Sang, appointed superintendent of schools for Duval County, Florida in 1976, describes his experiences in developing a school-based management organizational structure. Five principles are involved in the concept of school-centered organization including: 1) allocation of funds is based on needs of students; 2) specific educational goals are set by people associated with the schools. 3) decisions on how funds for instruction are to be spent are made in the school center. 4) organization of instruction is determined at the school level; and 5) parents participate in school decision making.

Weischadle, David. "School-Based Management and The Principal." The Clearinghouse, Vol. 54, No. 2, 1980, pp. 53-55.

School-based management involves the re-establishment of the principal as the leader of innovation. According to David Weischadle, Professor of Education at Montclair State College in Upper Montclair, New Jersey, to implement school-based management it is necessary for the principal to understand the concept and to become the prime agent in establishing school-based management in the district. The decision-making process shifts from the central district to the local school and the principal is put in direct control of the resources to operate the school. School-based

management usually includes the creation of a school council composed of members from the school community, including parents and students. The council assists the principal by participating in policy development and priority setting. School-based management provides principals with the means to execute important tasks, if the system contains the key ingredients of time, training and trust.

Wells, Barbara, and Carr, Larry. "With The Pursestrings, Comes The Power." Thrust For Educational Leadership, Vol. 8, No. 1, 1978, pp. 14-15.

As principals in the Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District at the time of publication, Barbara Wells and Larry Carr review the objectives of the district's adoption of school-based management in March, 1973. The implementation of the new management system has drastically broadened the role and increased the responsibility of the site administrator and increased the responsibility and accountability of service departments. Evaluation of the management system is based on a management-monitoring system which consists of a gradual follow-up study, staff survey, community survey, minimal essentials testing (grades 4-12), students sentiment index survey (grades 3-12), C.T.B.S. standardized testing, required state testing, and quality rating of the exterior and interior of all school district buildings.

Williams, Stanley, and Chandler, Patricia. "The Principalship: How Much Decentralization Is Too Much?" Thrust For Educational Leadership, Vol. 13, No. 4, 1984, pp. 18-19.

Stanley Williams was professor of education and administration at California State University-Long Beach and Patricia Chandler was with Paramount USD. Their article focuses on the limitations of decentralization in public schools. The major criticisms of decentralization are that funding, collective bargaining and control may be more difficult and that decentralization raises questions such as who is in charge, who makes the decisions and who is accountable for the results. Nonconformity of rules, policies and educational opportunities sometimes result and not all teachers and students are sufficiently mature or motivated to operate in a decentralized system.

Role of The Teacher

Caputo, Edward. "Freedom, Order and School-Based Management: One Principal's Story." Principal, November 1980, pp. 25-27.

Edward Caputo introduces the idea of the "fourth R", referring to relationships between students and teachers. Caputo discusses his philosophy of school-based management and says that the key to fostering relationships between teachers and students is to maintain a balance between freedom and constraint.

Dixon, Linda. "Teachers Take The Lead on School-Based Reform." NEA Today. December 1986, pp. 4-5.

Linda Dixon describes the National Education Association's (NEA) Mastery in Learning Project (MILP) which was operating at 27 schools in 19 states. At the time of publication, Dixon was a first grade teacher at Mt. Vernon Community School in Alexandria, Virginia, an MILP pilot school. Goals of NEA project included giving teachers more authority to choose and implement programs designed to improve students' learning.

Duke, Daniel; Showers, Beverly; and Imber, Michael. "Teachers as School Decision Makers." Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, Stanford University, Project Report No. 80-A7, 1980. 97 pages.

Daniel Duke, assistant professor of education at Stanford University and Beverly Showers and Michael Imber, doctoral students at Stanford's School of Education, identify school decision-making opportunities available to teachers, explore possible reasons for the small amount of teacher decision-making authority in the public schools, and discuss the relationship between teacher involvement in school decision making and productivity. The authors view teacher participation in school-level decision making as desirable, and argue that the way schools are structured and managed inhibit teachers from participating extensively in the making of decisions.

Teacher involvement is examined in nine areas: instructional coordination, curriculum development, professional development, evaluation, school improvement, personnel, rules and discipline, general administration, and policymaking. While there was evidence of teacher involvement in all of these areas, the authors found that teachers have more involvement than influence in these decision- making areas. The lack of teacher involvement is then examined from the perspectives of psychology, political science, sociology and organizational theory. The authors conclude that while each of these perspectives helps to provide an understanding of teacher decision-making at the school level, none alone provide a complete explanation for the current trend of teacher involvement.

School-Based Budgeting

Alexandruk, Fred. "School Budgeting in the Edmonton Public School District," M.A. Thesis. University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, 1985, 190 pages.

Fred Alexandruk examines the effectiveness of school budgeting in the Edmonton Public School District. Data was collected through a questionnaire on school budgeting distributed to 1,022 teachers and administrators in 34 schools. The findings indicated significant differences between schools in respondents' perceptions of the level of attainment of objectives and respondents' satisfaction with school budgeting. These differences are explained as an indication of differences in administrative style and/or practice among schools.

"Annual School-Based Program Budget." 1982-83 Planning and Budgeting For Educational Management, Duval County Schools, Jacksonville, Florida, 57 pages.

The Duval County (Florida) Public Schools have designed a model for use by school principals in developing budgets. The steps of the model for planning and developing school-based program budgets include: 1) developing a projected basic operating budget, 2) performing a needs assessment, 3) developing plans for annual school instructional improvement, 4) ranking needs and improvement plans for the coming budget year, 5) determining costs of the plans, 6) correlating cost requirements with total allocation, 7) finalizing an initial school-based budget, 8) documenting plans for instructional improvement, 9) reviewing the plans - performed by assistant superintendents, 10) finalizing the school-based budget, 11) developing evaluation designs for the improvement plans, 12) developing an evaluation report on the plans at the end of the year, 13) recycling and updating the budget and the plans, and 14) developing an annual school report. The article provides a prototype of the model in action, basing data on one of Duval County's elementary schools.

Caldwell, Brian J. "Implementation of Decentralized School Budgeting." Paper presented at the Canadian School Trustees' Association Congress on Education, Toronto, Ontario, June 17-21, 1978. 24 pages.

Brian Caldwell, of the Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, identifies the major issues which should be considered by school systems contemplating the adoption of school-based budgeting. In a study of seven school-based budgeting systems in Alberta in 1977, Caldwell found three distinct types of school involvement: 1) lump-sum per pupil allocation to schools, 2) use of previous patterns of expenditure and, 3) a highly centralized preparation phase followed by a highly decentralized administration phase.

Caldwell, Brian J. "Resource Allocation at the School Level: An Examination of School-Based Budgeting in Canada and the United States." Paper presented at the National Conference on Educational Administration of the Australian Council, Adelaide, South Australia, August 31-September 5, 1980. 54 pages.

In this paper, Caldwell discusses the allocation of resources at the school level, or school-based budgeting. The nature, extent and purpose of school-based budgeting as it is found in the U.S. and Canada is described and the Edmonton Public School District in Alberta, Canada is used as an illustration of a school-based budgeting program. The paper includes a discussion of problems of implementation and operation and suggests some implications for adopting school-based budgeting in the Australian context. The paper identifies critical issues raised by the practice of school-based budgeting including the impact on the role of the principal as well as issues related to choice, diversity, and educational quality.

Cunningham, Paul H. "Decentralized Budgeting: Making the Management Team Work." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National School Boards Association, Anaheim, California, April 1-4, 1978. 16 pages.

Paul Cunningham of the Dorchester County Board of Education expresses his views on decentralized budgeting. Considering the level of preparation and salaries of principals, greater decision-making responsibility should be given to principals. Cunningham concludes that the merits of decentralized budgeting far outweigh the disadvantages.

Dibski, Dennis. "Decentralized Budgeting and the Rural Saskatchewan Principal." Paper presented at the CASEA Conference, Canadian Society for the Study of Education, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, 1981. 14 pages.

Dennis Dibski of the Department of Educational Administration, University of Saskatchewan, describes the adoption of school-based budgeting in the Saskatchewan rural schools including a discussion of factors contributing to the move to decentralization, the extent of school-based budgeting in the rural school divisions, the types of budget items decentralized, and the kinds of allocation formulas and procedures for internal allocation. The author's data is based on a study completed by Rigby in 1981 (a master's thesis completed under the supervision of Dibski) which surveyed the principals of Saskatchewan's 60 rural school divisions. Rigby's questionnaire asked principals to indicate whether they were satisfied with the degree of budget decentralization and with decentralized personnel budgets. Based on Rigby's findings, it was concluded that principals generally favored school-based budgets and that the system facilitates the needs of the students but that the new system places more pressures on the principal.

Dickey, William K. "School Site Budgeting - A School Business Administrator's View." Educational Economics, February 1977, pp.15-17.

William K. Dickey, comptroller for the School Board of Alachua County, Florida at the time of publication, describes the rationale behind school-site budgeting. The decentralization of budgeting requires the restructuring of most roles in the school district. The principals become the key person in the system and they must be willing and able to assume the new responsibilities of managing a school center. Dickey presents three major concerns regarding decentralization: isolation, disproportionate amounts of time being spent on budgeting and too much influence by local self-interest groups and discusses how Alachua County avoided these problems.

Duncan, D. J., and Peach, J. W. "School-Based Budgeting: Implications for the Principal." Education Canada, Vol. 17, No. 3, 1977, pp. 39-41.

D. J. Duncan, as senior lecturer at Armidale College of Advanced Education in New South Wales, Australia, and J. W. Peach, as professor of educational administration at the University of Manitoba, discuss the implications of school-based budgeting for the role of the principal. The authors based their article on a research study of a school-based budgeting program introduced in a high school in a Canadian city. School-based budgeting requires changes in the decision-making process and communication patterns

and more time and energy on the part of principals due to their increased responsibilities involving budgetary decisions.

Garms, Walter; Guthrie, James; and Pierce, Lawrence. School Finance: The Economics and Politics of Public Education. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1978. 466 pages.

Walter Garms, University of Rochester; James Guthrie, University of California, Berkeley; and Lawrence Pierce, University of Oregon, express the view that the improvement of education requires renewed approaches for controlling educational costs as well as renewed commitment to the education of children by parents and teachers. This chapter examines current school management and budgeting methods and offers a proposal for improving the productivity and responsiveness of public schools. The proposal, which shifts much of the responsibility for managing public schools to the school site, is offered as the best solution for reducing the fiscal and political problems of local school districts. Four phases are suggested in the implementation of school site management; 1) developing implementation plans, 2) training school personnel, 3) eliminating legal barriers and, 4) allocating funds.

Greenhalgh, John. School Site Budgeting. Decentralized School Management. University Press of America, Lanham, Maryland, 1984. 193 pages.

John Greenhalgh describes the advantages and changes involved in decentralized decision making and school-site budgeting. He argues that school site-budgeting, as a plan to distribute all planning decisions to local school building administrators, is an improved process for promoting equality of educational opportunities. In a centrally administered school district, the finalization of a budget is buried deep within a central office accounting complex. In a decentralized school district, the budget of each instructional center is developed by building leaders, staff members, parents, students, and community members, and is open to public scrutiny. Greenhalgh describes the administrative and instructional framework and political changes involved in decentralized decision making at the school site. This document is designed to help schools and districts set up their own school-site budgeting program and includes information on establishing an overall district budget target, establishing basic (non school site) costs, assigning remaining funds to individual schools on a per capita basis, and developing individual school expenditure plans.

Schiering, David. "We Can Prove That Public Involvement Improves Schools." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National School Boards Association, Houston, Texas, March 31-April 3, 1984. 16 pages.

David Schiering uses the Cincinnati Public Schools to demonstrate that involving taxpayers in school district budgeting can generate school improvement. To establish this type of system and encourage community involvement the necessary conditions are described as: 1) the public must understand the financial condition of the schools; 2) the public must be involved in improving the position; 3) the public must be involved in deciding how the school funds should be used; 4) there must be long-term community participation; and 5) the local school community should be given the power

over spending in its schools. The Cincinnati district established a budget committee for each school, comprised of school staff and students and community members. Each year, the committees set educational goals and prepared the district budget based on the administration's draft. Using this process, the Cincinnati schools gained revenue and credibility and realized improvements in achievement, enrollment, attendance, and retention of white students.

School-Based Curriculum Development

Knight, Peter. "The Practice of School-Based Curriculum Development." Journal of Curriculum Studies, Vol. 17, No. 1, 1984, pp. 37-48.

Peter Knight of Martin's College, Lancaster, describes the process of school-based curriculum development (s.b.c.d.), defined as a change produced by creativity within a school leading to a change in curriculum content. This study reviews 50 cases of s.b.c.d., reporting on major aspects of the programs including the extent to which each school has incorporated s.b.c.d., and the programs' goals and implementation processes.

School-Based Management Councils

California State Department of Education. Establishing School Site Councils. California School Improvement Program. Sacramento, California, 1977. 30 pages.

This monograph, prepared by the California State Department of Education in cooperation with parents, teachers, students and administrators, focuses on the roles and responsibilities of the school-site council. The council is responsible for developing a school improvement plan, continuously reviewing the implementation of the plan, assessing the effectiveness of the school program, reviewing and updating the school improvement plan, and establishing the annual school improvement budget. This document was designed to assist school district governing boards, school principals, teachers, parents and students in initiating school improvement budgets and establishing school-site councils.

"School-Based Management in the Pine Hill Public Schools, A Handbook For School-Site Council Members," Pine Hill, New Jersey, June, 1983. 6 pages.

In 1982, the Pine Hill Board of Education, in cooperation with the National Council for Citizens in Education (NCCE), authorized an 18-month experimental program in school-based management. This handbook was developed as a result of meetings of a steering committee made up of members of the professional staff, the community and the board of education. The handbook establishes guidelines for school-site council members including a discussion of the purpose of the council, the philosophy of shared governance, and the nature of council meetings and membership.

Case Studies

Beaubier, Edward W., and Thayer, Arthur N. (Eds). "Participative Management - Decentralized Decision-Making: Working Models. A Monograph." California Association of School Administrators, Burlingame, California, 1973. 87 pages.

The authors, assistant executive directors of ASCA at the time of publication, describe guidelines of decentralization and participative management and provide examples of working models in 16 California school districts. The authors argue that although they will not solve all problems in a school or district, decentralization and participative management provide structures which encourage creative participation and serve as tools that can be used effectively to build accountability into education.

Beers, Donald E. "School-Based Management." Paper presented at the national convention of the National Association of Elementary School Principals, New Orleans, April 12-16, 1984. 19 pages.

Donald Beers presents an overview of the school-based management model being initiated in the Charleston County, South Carolina School District. Beers describes school-based management as a model based on the philosophy that every school has different needs and therefore requires different resources. A management team should be established to make shared decisions on all phases of district activities. Pilot programs initiated in 20 schools featured local school management teams made up of the principal, teachers, parents and community support persons; training in management practices for the principals and teams; and a liaison person who works with the school team and the district to facilitate program development. In some of the 50 other schools in the district, programs had begun which incorporated aspects of school-based management such as a building-conservation incentive program and a program to reduce the number of teacher absences.

David, Jane, and Peterson, Susan. "Can Schools Improve Themselves? A Study of School-Based Management Programs." Bay Area Research Group, Palo Alto, California, 1984. 90 pages.

Six school-based improvement programs in elementary schools serving children from low-income families were studied to determine how effective these plans have been and what factors have served to aid or hinder them. The programs studied were in 32 schools and 17 school districts in seven states and included the New York City School Improvement Project, California School Improvement Program, Individually Guided Education, Florida School Advisory Councils, New York City Local School Development, Schoolwide Projects Provision of Title I.

No two school-based programs were alike but the six school-based improvement programs studied shared three central features: 1) a focus on the school as a whole; 2) involvement of teachers in designing improvements; and 3) incorporation of elements of rational planning. Five conclusions were reached from the evidence: 1) the principles of treating the school as an organizational activity and developing a process for ongoing planning and

review with staff involvement is sound; 2) the creation of school-based planning and change is difficult; 3) the fact that schools can form planning groups and successfully change nonstructural aspects of the school provides considerable hope for the eventual transfer into instructional areas; 4) little evidence was found to support the fear that students in need would be overlooked in school-based programs; 5) the kinds of knowledge, skills and actions essential to instructional leadership can be used as criteria for identifying and training local staff as change agents and to develop and expand preservice training programs for principals and teachers.

Decker, Erwin, and others. "Site Management. An Analysis of the Concepts and Fundamental Operational Components Associated with the Delegation of Decision-Making Authority and Control of Resources to the School-Site Level in the California Public School System." Sacramento, California, California State Department of Education, 1977. 37 pages.

During 1976 and 1977, the Educational Management and Evaluation Commission evaluated the pros and cons of decentralizing decision-making authority to the school level as a public school management technique. The majority of the research was conducted by personnel from several California education associations and school districts. The report served as a summary for members of the California State Board of Education and as a resource for school district governing boards and district administrators. Erwin Decker, former assistant to the deputy superintendent for administration, defines site management, describes potential obstacles and legal considerations, and provides four examples of site management outside of California including New York City; Louisville, Kentucky; Florida; and Tacoma, Washington.

Educational Alternatives Committee. "Rebuilding Education To Make It Work." Citizens League, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1982. 66 pages.

The Citizens League of Minnesota argues the need for a deregulated, decentralized atmosphere, or school-based management, in Minnesota's public schools. At least two features are included in almost any school-based management plan: 1) greater control over the school budget at the school level, i.e., more control over resources, is exercised by those most closely involved with the educational process itself--teachers, principals and parents, and 2) some kind of governance council is formed at the school level. This council may take different forms of composition, e.g. parents, community members, students and educators. The council's essential function is to determine program priorities and allocate the school's budget accordingly.

"Improving Education in Florida: A Reassessment." A report by the Governor's Citizen's Committee on Education, Tallahassee, Florida, 1978. 443 pages.

In this paper the Select Joint Committee on Public Schools of the Florida Legislature reviews and reaffirms findings and recommendations of the Governor's Citizens' Committee on Education presented in March 1973. The Select Committee stated that school-based management: 1) is based on sound educational principles and is administratively feasible; 2) promotes equal educational opportunity by enabling educators to tailor school programs to

the particular educational requirements of individual students; 3) fosters a more efficient use of funds by insuring that resources are allocated to activities closely related to the pursuit of local educational objectives; and 4) is a practical way of administering school programs, given the difficulties of managing classroom activities from the district or state offices. The Committee discussed implementation problems and made several recommendations regarding future efforts of school-based management in Florida school districts.

Morgan, James. "The Cincinnati School-Based Management Information System." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada, April 11-15, 1983. 61 pages.

This report describes steps taken by the Cincinnati Public Schools to systematically obtain information to be used in managing and administering the schools. A School Information System (SIS) was developed to provide the district's 57 elementary and 22 secondary schools with data in areas such as student and staff characteristics and achievement test and survey results. Each school established a Local School Advisory Council (LSAC), composed of teachers, staff, parents, high school students and members of local business and community groups which identified problem areas of the school and set goals for the next school year. To aid in planning and implementation, a Local School Budgeting (LSB) program was developed to supplement School Management Plans prepared at the beginning of each year and reviewed on a quarterly basis. While the program had only been in operating for one year (1982-83), the author reports that the results already indicated that the system would contribute to improved school management decision making. Eleven appendixes include data collected on Cincinnati's SIS.

National Swedish Board of Education. "Education--Society; Curricular Theory," Stockholm, 1986. 18 pages.

This project investigated the way schools and teaching are affected by the local community and the way central directives are transformed into a local educational reality. Four municipalities in Sweden were studied since 1981, and the wide range of information was collected included data on demographics in the municipalities, education authorities and school boards, student achievement and opinions of school personnel and students. The topics of inquiry were treated with reference to deconcentration and decentralization.

Nirenberg, John. "A Comparison of the Management Systems of Traditional and Alternative Public High Schools." Educational Administrative Quarterly, Vol. 13, No. 1, 1977, pp. 86-104.

John Nirenberg, assistant principal in the School of Business at Ohio University, reviews the managerial systems and organizational climate of alternative and traditional public high schools. The study found significant differences in administrative climate, teacher sense of power and the degree of bureaucratization between the traditional and alternative school settings and suggests that alternative schools possess the organizational ability to create a viable managerial model.

Northwest Area Foundation. "School-Based Management, An Interim Report." St. Paul, Minnesota, 1985, 16 pages.

The Northwest Area Foundation in 1981 became interested in the idea of decentralized management as a means of increasing involvement in schools and improving education. Following a series of community meetings across the Foundation's eight-state region, the Foundation issued a Request for Proposals in school-based management. The eight school districts which received funding from the foundation were Clackamas County School District #62, Oregon City, Oregon; Edmonds School District #15, Edmonds, Washington; Hopkins School District #270, Hopkins, Minnesota; Independent School District #196, Rosemount, Minnesota; Independent School District #281, Robbinsdale, Minnesota; Mercer Island School District #400, Mercer Island, Washington; Rochester Independent School District, Rochester, Minnesota; and St. Louis Park School District #283, St. Louis Park, Minnesota. Each district was structuring its own system of school-based management and its own process for achieving it. This report examines the differences in definitions and processes of school-based management and the varying successes and tensions which result.

Ornstein, Allan C. "School Decentralization: Descriptions of Selected Systems." NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 59, No. 398, pp. 24-33.

Author Allan Ornstein, associate professor of education at Loyola University in Chicago, discusses three alternatives for governing metropolitan school systems including administrative decentralization, community participation, and community control. Seven selected decentralized school systems are described including New York City; Detroit, Michigan; Dade County, Florida; St. Louis, Missouri; El Paso, Texas; and Minneapolis, Minnesota. Of the seven programs, two (New York City and Detroit) have systems which combine administrative decentralization with community control. The other five programs combine administrative decentralization with community participation.

Pink, William, and Wallace, David K. "Creating Effective Schools: Moving From Theory To Practice." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 1984. 78 pages.

William Pink and David Wallace describe the initiation of the Effective Schools Pilot Project (ESPP) in the Kansas City, Missouri School District. The key principles and goals which have guided the activities of the project are listed. Five K-6 schools and one school containing a kindergarten and grades 5 and 6 were the locus for the program which involved school-site teams working in collaboration with both central office personnel and consultants from outside the district to develop a plan based on the school improvement literature. Six components were identified in the implementation of the project: 1) curriculum alignment, 2) instruction, 3) leadership, 4) expectations, 5) school climate, and 6) parent involvement. The goals guiding the project were based on a broad objective to improve opportunities for academic success for students in project schools. The project development is described in month-by-month detail. Factors which distinguish this project from others attempted in the district were the

interest of the superintendent and the facts that the intervention was planned by the school-site personnel, directed by the district, and based on both site- generated data and the literature on school improvement.

Rennie, Robert J. "School Centered Management: A Matter of Style!" School Business Affairs, Vol. 51, No. 4, April 1985, pp. 64-65, 67.

Robert Rennie, Director of Data Processing for the Brevard County School District in Titusville, Florida has been an active participant in the development and growth of school-based management in Florida. Rennie argues that the focus of educational management should be on the school and proposes a system called school-centered management (SCM), defined as a system of educational management providing the appropriate balance of authority and accountability. Various management styles are discussed including the autocratic or dictatorial style of management, the charismatic or natural leader, the democratic form and the contingency or situation style of management. It is concluded that as a situational approach to management, SCM provides the flexibility to involve community and staff, to communicate to all levels, to respond to local and district demands and to show ownership of the results of effective management.

Throop, Frank A. "Professional Autonomy in the Lansing Public Schools: A Model For The Decentralization of Administrative Functions In An Urban School System." Ph. D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1973, 197 pages.

In a study of the decentralization of administrative functions in the Lansing Public Schools, Frank Throop examines the role that supportive personnel at the central office level play in developing strategies and operational procedures at the local building level. A questionnaire was distributed to all administrative personnel in the central office, the superintendent and staff, the directors and consultants in the various divisions, building level administrators and a representative sample of teachers in nine secondary schools. The questionnaire was developed as a means of determining the effects of the decentralization plan, to determine the extent to which professional educators perceive increased school site autonomy as influencing them personally and professionally, and the extent to which educators perceive increased school site autonomy will improve the educational program for the youth of the community they serve. The study found that the district's organization showed centralization of some administrative functions but generally most decisions were forced to the lowest possible level through the philosophy of building autonomy.

Wise, Arthur; Darling-Hammond, Linda; McLaughlin, Milbrey; Bernstein, Harriet. "Case Studies For Teacher Evaluation: A Study of Effective Practices." Rand, Santa Monica, California, 1984. 166 pages.

This report presents four case studies on teacher evaluation practices. Four school districts were selected representing diverse teacher evaluation processes and organizational environments: Salt Lake City, Utah; Lake Washington, Washington; Greenwich, Connecticut; and Toledo, Ohio. The Salt Lake City case study is relevant to study of school-based management practices in its discussion of the concept of shared governance and the notion of accountability. Management by decentralized consensus among parents, teachers and administrators in the Salt Lake City District allows widespread input into nearly all aspects of school operations, including the assessment of teachers.

Yin, Robert; Blank, Rolf; and White, J. Lynne. "Excellence in Urban High Schools. An Emerging District/School Perspective." COSMOS Corp., Washington, D.C., 1984. 56 pages.

This paper is a discussion of a three-year study of urban schools. The study had two major objectives: the identification of school management practices and the identification of ways in which school district policies can facilitate the goals of the school. Two theories for managing schools were tested, including the school effectiveness theory and the organizational excellence theory. A major proposition at the outset of the District/Secondary study had to do with school autonomy. The proposition was that excellent urban high schools may very well be those where district policies and procedures are minimal or rarely enforced. The study found that schools were much more amenable to management initiatives than originally thought and that the sources of managerial initiatives are much more diverse and complex than the single organization implicit to school effectiveness or managerial excellence theory. While both theories lean heavily toward considering the school as the sole source of managerial control over the school, the findings from the District/Secondary study suggest a pattern of collaboration in which schools and districts act to "co-manage" the school in specific ways that produce desirable school outcomes.

Miscellaneous

Callison, William L., and Beckman, Walter F. "Organizational Control Tops Priority List." NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 63, No. 426, April, 1979, pp. 99-103.

William Callison and Walter Beckman were professors of educational administration at California State University, Fullerton at the time of publication. A survey of 200 secondary school administrators found that issues related to the control of their schools were more critical to secondary school administrators than issues of their own welfare.

Kirst, Michael W. "The Changing Politics of Education: Actions and Strategies." Paper in The Changing Politics of Education: Prospects For The 1980s, Edith K. Mosher and Jennings L. Wagoner (Eds), McCutchan Publishing Corp., Berkeley, California, 1978, pp. 145-170.

Michael Kirst, associate professor of education and business administration, Stanford University and chairman of the California State Board of Education at the time of publication, discusses the politics of elementary and secondary education. In the area of local governance it is concluded that the primary role of the federal and state governments should be to provide resources and stimulation for the major decisions at the school site.

Peterson, Kent. "The Effect of School District Size on the Use of Hierarchical and Non-hierarchical Mechanisms of Control." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association in New Orleans, April, 1984. 25 pages.

Kent Peterson of Vanderbilt University discusses the mechanisms of control which the central office uses to direct and channel the work of principals and the way school district size differentially affects the use of those controls. The data for this investigation were collected in interviews with 113 suburban elementary school principals from 59 districts in the Midwest. There are six mechanisms of organizational control according to Peterson: 1) supervision, 2) input control, 3) behavior control, 4) output control, 5) selection-socialization, and 6) environment control. These forms of organizational control are broken down into two major types: hierarchical and non-hierarchical. The data suggests that constraints under which principals work will be substantially different depending on the size of the district in which they work. Evidence is provided for the need for further research and particular areas of investigation are suggested.

Phillips, John. "Abolishing Tobacco Use in Secondary Schools--A School-Based Management Problem." NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 68, No. 468, 1984, pp. 121-123.

Author John Phillips, associate superintendent, Marietta City Schools, Marietta, Georgia, discusses an attempt by Norcross High School in Guinnett County, Georgia to eliminate problems associated with smoking by students in school. An extensive campaign was conducted to educate citizens and students on the "no tobacco use" policy, or the implementation of a ban on the use of tobacco. By the end of the first year, the school found fewer drug problems, a cleaner environment, less tardiness and vandalism, and better student performance.

Pierce, Lawrence C. "Emerging Policy Issues In Public Education." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 58, No. 2, 1976, pp. 173-76.

Lawrence Pierce, Department of Political Science, University of Oregon, Eugene, speculates on emerging issues in educational policy. First, he predicts that determining the appropriate size of educational units is likely to become an important policy issue. Second, a major battle is developing over who should control public schools. Pierce proposes school-site management as a system to give each school in a district far greater responsibility for program, budget and personnel decisions.

Talbert, Joan. "School Organizational and Institutional Change: Exchange and Power in Loosely Coupled Systems." Institute for Research and Educational Finance and Governance, Stanford University, Project Report No. 81-A9, 1980. 38 pages.

Joan Talbert, assistant professor of education at Stanford University, presents a model of local school authority relations which fits the institutional patterns observed for the U.S. system. Propositions are offered regarding variation in school organization and the effects of general institution trends, in particular declining public support of education and system centralization. This paper includes a review of the literature on institutional patterns of authority and centrally planned educational change. The exchange-theory approach to organizational authority relations is contrasted with other organizational perspectives on authority and control, and its particular relevance and use for analyzing loosely-coupled systems are suggested. The analysis suggests gradual drift toward enhanced informal exchange and interdependence at the local school level, and, by implication, tighter coupling of the educational administration and teaching subsystems.